This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

AH GJJV G

Digitized by Google

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

VOLUME V.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY A. TOMPKINS.
1848.

Digitized by Google

WILLIAM A. HALL, PRINTER,
22 School Street.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I.—Astronomy and Religion..... 5

II.—The False and the True Power..... 22

III.—Man's Position in the Scale of Being..... 32

IV.—Christian Consolations..... 36

V.—The Influence of Christianity on the Roman Civilization 65

VI.—Dogmatic and Religious History of Universalism in America 79

VII.—Evangeline 104

VIII.—Literary Notices.....109

IX.—Miracles, and the Laws of Nature.....113

X.—The Christian Doctrine of the Atonement.....133

XI.—Bushnell on Christian Nurture..... 144

XII.—Temptation, its Evil Effects, and their Remedy.....158

XIII.—Protestantism—Universalism—in France 165

XIV.—The Gospel History; its Genuineness and Truth..... 179

XV.—Mont Blanc and the Alps.....197

XVI.—Literary Notices..... 214

XVI.—Memory and Conscience in the Future State.....221

XVII.—Our Duties in respect to the Skepticism of the Age....232

XVIII.—Poetry. 1. Omnipresence of the Deity. 2. Beauty unheeded and unheeding. 8. The Deep.....248

XIX.—Theology and Literature.....252

Digitized by Google

ARTICLE. PAGE.

XX.—The Unwritten History of Universalism.....272

XXI.—Permanence of the Pastoral Relation.....285

XXII.—Whittemore on the Revelation.....304

XXIII.—Slavery in the United States.....321

XXIV.—Art, and its Relations,.....329

XXV.—The Inspiration of the Scriptures..... 343

XXVI.—Silent Eloquence 358

XXVII.—Emily Plater.....361

XXVIII.—Rise and Prevalence of Unitarian Views among the Universalists.....370

XXIX.—Nicodemus.....395

XXX.—My Sleeping Children.... 403

XXXI.—The Idea of God and the Truths of Christianity.....407

XXXII.—Literary Notices.....419

ERROR.—On page 95, Mr. Shippie Townsend is said to have been "a merchant." He was not a merchant, but a mechanic.

Digitized by Google

Period
2075
v. 5
1848

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

Article 1.

Astronomy and Religion.

Thoughts on some important points relating to the System of the World, by J. P. Nichol, LL. D., Professor of Astronomy in the University of Glasgow: Wm. Tait, Edinburgh, 1846.

The Sidereal Messenger, a Monthly Journal, devoted to Astronomical Science, edited by O. M. Mitchell. Cincinnati: Derby, Bradley & Co.

The year 1846 was signalized by brilliant astronomical achievements. We allude to the results of Lord Rosse's great telescope, to the discovery of a new planet, and to Maedler's doctrine of a central sun. It is pleasant to contemplate such acquisitions. They cost no blood, and bequeath no evil heritage. They are conquests won in celestial fields — the peaceful and everlasting triumphs of intellect, planting still further into the infinite the shining landmarks of human progress.

But such attainments do more than this. They lead us into a train of elevated and religious thought. They not only enlarge, but sanctify our ideas of nature, which is manifestly also an inspired Scripture, a Divine Revelation, filled beyond conception with the riches of omnipotence and love. God appears more awful. The fact of *being*, the relations of our earthly life and of the soul, grow more solemn and mysterious.

Digitized by Google

In calling the attention of our readers to these astronomical developements, we do not intend to enter into scientific details. With the general facts they are already well acquainted, or can be, by looking into the works mentioned at the head of this article. Nor are we, at present, prepared to show how far these facts have been modified by recent investigations. But, in accordance with the object of this Review, we propose to apply these facts to their highest use, — to show their relation to certain themes of religious thought and action.

We referred, first, to results obtained by the great telescope of Lord Rosse. The history of natural science, like all other departments of human progress, manifests a Providence ever revealing occasions for intellectual effort, and furnishing new agents for intellectual attainment; opening only by degrees, to man's inquisitiveness, the great sphere of truth, yet always tempting his research, and welcoming it with ample rewards. When the Copernican theory, placing astronomy upon its true basis, had established an accurate stand-point for calculation and discovery, and perhaps about all that the naked eye could do was accomplished, the children of an optician in Holland, playing with some glasses, suggested the invention of the telescope; and, for the first time, the UNIVERSE burst upon the vision of man. Our earth dwindled to an atom, and the sun to a star. Specks of light multiplied and expanded into an area that the curiosity of man can never exhaust: too deep for Newton's thought, too vast for Herschel's vision, in which Rosse should discover swarming firmaments, and La Place suspect the dawn of new cosmogonies.

From the leaden tube of Galileo, we have attained to the splendid reflecting and refracting instruments of modern times. And, in every instance, improvement in the power of the telescope has opened deeper vistas in space, and unveiled more magnificence in the heavens; though improvement in this department, owing to certain optical difficulties, has not kept pace with that of other inventions. When Sir William Herschel constructed his famous forty-feet telescope, the result was in proportion to the power. But the difficulties alluded to have been encountered the most successfully by Lord Rosse. The great telescope of

Digitized by Google

his predecessor was, as we have just said, forty feet long, and was four feet in diameter; his own is seven feet in diameter, and more than fifty feet long, and for this, with enormous labor and expense, he has constructed a speculum six feet in diameter. The power of such an instrument is almost incalculable. It commands bewildering depths of space, and will solve some of the most curious questions. We may gain some idea of this, when we learn that while the great telescope of Herschel had a space-penetrating power one hundred and ninety-two times that of the naked eye, this has power to pierce five hundred times deeper than the unassisted vision.[1] It will descry a star so far off that its light, in order to reach the earth, travels sixty thousand years.[2] As it is confined in its range, for the present, to a segment of the heavens, and from other causes, the results of this instrument, compared with its capacity, have as yet been small, but the hints of what it will accomplish, are splendid and astonishing.

But the fact which most impresses us is that even this enormous vision discovers no boundary to the universe, no stint in the munificence of creation. As in a leaf, or a drop of water, so everywhere space is crowded with existences. Before the telescope, the small mass of condensed light expands and crumbles into stars, the dazzled eye looks up through pyramids of suns, and the solitary spot in the heavens becomes suddenly changed into a city of God, luminous and hospitable, where worlds career and constellations shake their awful clusters. But as the mind becomes acquainted with these, and seeks for a limit, the vast horizon widens, and ghostly shapes start out to tell of *new firmaments*, that have brooded until now beyond all human ken. "However potent the telescope," says Nichol, "no man dares reckon that all things are taken in by its vision, or that it has penetrated to the outer battlements of this majestic stellar creation, any more than that, previously, all things were seen by the unassisted eye. Nay, the telescope itself, in every stage, has made very contrary declarations, and proclaimed how far it lingers behind a comprehension of the mysteries of existence, even when unfolding so unexpected wonders. What mean, for instance, those dim spots, which unknown before,

[1] Nichol's System of the World.—p. 8. [2] Nichol, p. 8.

Digitized by Google

loom in greater and greater numbers on the horizon of every new instrument, unless they are gleams it is obtaining on its own frontier, of a mighty infinite beyond, also studded with glories, and enfolding what is seen as a minute and subservient part. Yes! even the six-feet mirror, after its powers of distinct vision are exhausted, becomes, in its turn, simply as the child gazing on these mysterious lights with awful and hopeless wonder." [3]

But not only are we bewildered by the number of those myriads that gleam and sparkle above us, but by the inconceivable estimates of *space* and *time* which they force upon us. At first, the actual remoteness of our sun, and the distances of the planets, were marvellous revelations. Then the idea that from the nearest fixed star these planets are not seen, and the sun is but a star, was extensive and confounding. But space and time as illustrated by these familiar facts, become absolutely trivial compared with recent discoveries. In looking through the telescope, we may behold in the constellation Orion, a dim, nebulous speck which has heretofore defied all attempts at solution. But should the indications which now brighten before the telescope of Lord Rosse be confirmed,[4] that speck is a *solar system*, a reservoir of suns, and so compressed is it by distance, that what seems to us a filmy patch, if no farther from us than a star of the eighth magnitude, does in fact cover a space exceeding the dimensions of our sun millions upon millions of times. "And yet," says a writer in the Dublin Review, "this is but an atom in the masses of nebulous matter which we see all around. . . . To give the full grandeur of the conception that now dawns upon us, let it be conceived that our whole visible universe with all its parts, its myriads of suns and stars which we see all around us, *is but a nebula in the vastness of space!* — that just as the nebulæ appear nebulous to us, so also, to an observer in one of the worlds of these distant regions, all the bright and glorious orbs we see, not alone our own little system — the sun which rules our day, and the moon which lights our night — but suns and stars and all —

[3] System of the World—p. 35.

[4] We have just learned while preparing this article, that the nebula in Orion, has been completely resolved by the new telescope in the observatory at Cambridge.

Digitized by Google

Sirius, and Procyon, and Capella, stars of the first and stars of the twelfth magnitude — bodies separated from each other by myriads of millions of miles — are all brought together in such apparent proximity, as to be seen under an almost imperceptible angle, and in the appearance of a faint patch of misty light!"

These conceptions of space are only equalled by the association of time. The light from those phantom shapes which appear upon the extreme verge of Lord Rosse's telescope, if they be firmaments, has consumed in reaching our earth, *thirty millions of years!* [5] Nor let us imagine that this exhausts the universe, or is more than a unit in the measurement of those spaces which separate us from the remotest forms of being!

We have not dwelt upon these things to amuse our readers with wonders, or to weary them with details. But, though feebly, we would bring before them the magnitude of creation. As the torch of discovery flickers in these tremendous and confounding lights, and trembles in faint shadow upon the awful veil that hides the *unexplored*, we are impressed with a fact which is associated with all deep religious thought and feeling — the fact of *mystery*. We feel how strict is the meaning of the apostle's words — "For we know but in part." It is a truth which has been felt most by the greatest intellects. Almost in the same language as Paul's, said La Place, the plummet dropping from his dying hands, "that which we know is little; that which we know not is immense." And those words of Newton thrill us again — "I know not what I may appear to the world; but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea-shore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me."

All our researches end in the inexplicable. In the remotest fields of heaven, and in the fibres of the way-side moss, there is that which invites, yet baffles us. We strip off a few concentric phenomena, but we cannot pierce to the core of anything. We grasp a few great principles, but we cannot explain final causes. The little child asks questions that have always puzzled us, and that we can

[5] Nichol, p. 36.

Digitized by Google

never answer. The last analysis of matter, and its relation to spirit, what are they? The appalling idea of *being*, who can fathom it? What is our life with these mystic currents that traverse it, these affections that interlace it and grow in it, sojourning in this tabernacle of flesh, vanishing like a cloud? What connection have we, on this dim ball rushing through space, with those distant majesties of being? What is their destiny and ours through these ever-moving cycles? The loftiest wisdom is rebuked, and becomes almost fatuous before this infinite mystery.

And yet nothing is more common among men than the assumption of premises which can only rest upon perfect knowledge. Nothing is more common than the denial of aught that interrupts our order of thought, or transcends our experience. The mind becomes stubborn when beseiged by an extraordinary conception. It is staggered by the announcement that light is thirty millions of years in travelling through a certain distance, and refuses to believe because it is extraordinary! But it is as idle for us to deny these enormous times and spaces, as it would have been for a Chaldean shepherd to refuse the modern doctrine of our solar system, which has transformed yonder points of light to suns and worlds, simply because it would have transcended his conception. The geologist breaks open the earth like a huge sarcophagus, and reads its fossil hieroglyphics, and finds embalmed ages. The astronomer points his tube to heaven, and receives the ray of vision across abysses, in travelling which, thought staggers and dies. And when these show us how trivial and comparative are our ideas of space and time, why do we refuse to credit them? Because, these trivial and comparative ideas have been to us all-comprehending and absolute. We have dared to stake out a circle in the infinite, and call that circle the All. One heave of that shoreless sea, has swept away our petty landmarks and confounded us. And yet the devout mind should be prepared for such revelations of science, nor should it stagger at these enormous estimates. If God is infinite, we should expect creation, life, bliss everywhere — a universe bounded only by His attributes.

The use of science is great, if it produce no other good, in the fact that it baffles our experience and humbles our

Digitized by Google

presumption; for we hold this very empiricism to be the root of all that unbelief which denies and scoffs at spiritual realities. The sceptic holds no other reason against these, than that they are transcendant. But now, seeing this material glory, will he deny an intelligent cause and meaning for it? In a universe so full of grand and solemn mysteries, dare he reject the idea of inspiration, the intervention of miracle, the doctrine of immortality? Nature rebukes such flippant assumption. It is continually revealing the transcendant and the inexplicable. It irresistibly forces us to acknowledge an origin and a destiny greater than itself. And never, until we throw by our exclusiveness and our dogmatism, and bend in humility, are we permitted to ascend to higher and more perfect attainments.

We referred, in the second place, to the discovery of a new planet. Of the circumstances preceding this discovery, and of the extraordinary calculations of the French astronomer, Le Verrier, our readers are well aware. Until near the close of the last century, Saturn was the remotest known planet of our system. To this was then added Uranus or Herschel. But certain perturbations or irregularities in the orbit of this last body, have long presented a problem to astronomers. Le Verrier set himself to the solution of the problem. Rejecting all hypotheses which disagreed with the great law of gravitation, after an enormous labor of revision and calculation, he was able to announce as one great cause of these disturbances, the existence of a planet beyond the orbit of Herschel.

Close upon this announcement, in September of last year, a new planet was discovered from the observatory of Berlin. And however much the observed phenomena of Neptune may fail to answer the requirements of Le Verrier's calculation, yet that calculation must stand as a sublime triumph of intellect. As an accession to the method of astronomical investigation, it is highly important. Says a writer, "Hitherto geometricians followed the following formula — 'knowing the position of a planet, deduce from it the perturbations which it produces on its neighbors!' . . . . Le Verrier reverses the formula by saying, 'knowing the perturbations expe-

Digitized by Google

rienced by a planet, deduce from them the existence and discovery of another planet — of the perturbating planet, and the place which it should occupy.'"

But the peculiarity of this achievement which we would now especially notice, consists in the power of mind which it exhibits, — the spectacle of pure intellect feeling along the line of induction, the calm reliance upon *reason.*

And here again, we touch upon a subject closely connected with religion. Although we are dismayed by the splendors of the universe, and the mystery which overshadows them all, and are subdued into a deep humility, yet we reject the conclusions of a false theology on the one hand, and of a morbid scepticism on the other, and gratefully feel that we stand upon some actual knowledge, however limited — that we grasp realities — in one word, that reason can legitimate truth. If gazing upon that ocean of suns and firmaments innumerable, we have shrunk within ourselves even to insignificance; if we have exclaimed with the tremulous wonder of the Pslamist, "When we consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained, what is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him?" Let us also, seeing how great is the power that He has bestowed upon us in the gift of reason, continue to say with the Psalmist, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor."

There is with some not only a distrust, but a contempt of reason, as blind and weak. This is a great mistake. Undoubtedly men may assume for reason, a perfection, or infallibility, which should be rebuked, which, as we have just seen, is rebuked by the mysteries that hover around us. But to deny the power and the dignity of reason, is to deny the greatest natural gift which God has bestowed upon man It is the noblest distinction of man. To trace its history, may be, to some, only the discovery of foolish and painful imperfections. But to him who looks with a right vision it is far otherwise. That history is the record of noble achievements. The dignity and destiny of man are demonstrated through those struggles of reason. It has often failed, but has never settled in error. It constantly emerges and attains a higher point. Swathed about

Digitized by Google

with cumbrous systems, it breaks through them all, makes discoveries, solves mysteries, and ever rises and reaches forward to acquisitions of knowledge and of power. Is it said that we expose reason in a pitiable plight by referring to its absurdities and mistakes? We ask, in reply, what has corrected those mistakes — what has shown them to be absurdities? Reason! Had it wandered forever, had it buried and embalmed itself in error, the contrary proposition would stand. But it possesses a self-rectifying and progressive power, and it appears the more admirable because of those perplexities. Of all visible beings, man alone *advances*, and he does so by this inward force, this contending and developing intellect. The beast is to-day as he was in the herds of the Chaldean and the Jew. The ant, though it teaches us with the same rebuke as in the days of Solomon, knows no more, does no more. The bird of the air beats the same trackless path, directed by the all-guiding Hand. But to man God has appointed a different destiny, and made him peculiar by the gift of an inspiration, compared with which the glories of the outward universe are dim and perishable. In his frame he is related to the earth on which he lives; he is "brother to the clod," and shall "mix with the elements." But in his reason, his intellect, his spiritual portion, he is allied to God. He was ushered into being with special and crowning ceremony. Of him alone it is said, God made him in his own image, breathed into his nostrils, and he became a living soul.

Nor let us talk about "the pride of reason," any more than the pride of eye-sight."[6] While he would be foolish indeed who should speak of either as his own absolutely, and boast himself in their excellence, God has made the eyes and the reason to be used. We have no capacity which was not meant to be employed. God makes no revelation when he does not intend us to see. We cannot pry into his hidden counsels if we would; though we should beware of all irreverence in our method of seeking. When in the right spirit, we should never fear to exercise

[6] See this admirably illustrated by Blanco White, in his "Observations on Orthodoxy and Heresy," pp. 107–109. We should be glad, if we had room, to quote the passage.

Digitized by Google

reason. The universe is as a great volume, opening leaf after leaf to the humble yet aspiring intellect, and one of its noblest objects is the education of reason. For this are its ever-widening prospect, and its occurrent mysteries. The alphabet, to the little child, is as the nebulæ to the philosopher. They both answer the great end of stimulating curiosity, and when the soul penetrates one secret, it passes with additional power to the solution of a higher; all the while receiving into itself a golden residuum, a permanent virtue, which is the best and final result. If we seek reverently, then, we cannot seek too high, nor commit the paradox of being proud. God has given to man the glorious privilege to *know;* to rise and unwind the coil of material circumstances, to question nature and make it tractable, to find out the filaments of being and the law of order to track creation back close to the shadow of His infinite counsel, and to ascend the starry scale of progress forever.

Nor can reason in its true exaltation derogate from the glory of the Creator. Some few may be so presumptuous as to honor it without acknowledging the source from which it springs, the light that illuminates, the life that sustains it. But the remedy for this idolatry of reason, is simply the right exercise of reason. No truly great mind ever admired itself instead of the Divine Intelligence. But every new discovery, while it demonstrates the power and dignity of the finite, celebrates the infinite reason; and the intellect of man in its achievements makes more conspicuous the glory of Him whose image it is, and whose workings it feebly illustrates.

But let us not overlook the kindred fact that not only do such achievements as Le Verrier's testify to reason, but to the whole spiritual nature of man. Reason possesses dignity only as a part or function of this spiritual nature; it is admirable only in that rectitude which it draws from our moral being. And to this spiritual nature does the outward universe in all the grandeur of recent discoveries, bear witness. In this point of view, the position of the materialist dwindles to utter folly. Such things as God and virtue, and an immortal being in man, must be. The stupendous mechanism of nature is disproportionate to any other scheme. As a theatre of moral action, a place

Digitized by Google

of discipline, an arena for the sublime conflict of the will, its vastness becomes harmonious, and we detect a reason for its mysteries. Before these grand and solemn witnesses, our sense of duty becomes elevated, and our sensualisms look poor and mean. We will not dwell upon this point except to urge the fact that such action of reason upon nature, as is evinced in these recent discoveries, furnishes a most powerful demonstration of the truth of man's immortality. We feel that the soul cannot perish, which is thus continually seeking new truth, and rests not content with present limits; which thus fathoms and commands all outward realities; which paces every league of the celestial arc; knows, as a mariner knows the sea, the distant latitudes where the ghastly comet flames; wanders amid the spectral nebulæ, and makes suns and systems to be but glittering beads upon the aspiring thread of its induction. There is a future life. In a universe so spherical and whole as this, reason argues that its own *incompleteness and capacity for more*, are suggestive, are prophetical. Under-shadows and cross-lights of mystery, these filmy depths of present being shudder in sympathy with something beyond.

We alluded, in the last place, to Maedler's doctrine of a *Central Sun*. This astronomer has given his reasons for maintaining that as to our own group of planets there is a common centre of attraction, so is there a great centre to all our starry firmament.[7] "I therefore," says he, "pronounce the Pleiades to be the central group of the entire system of the fixed stars, limited by the great stratum of the Milky Way, and Alcyone as the individual star of this group which combines the greatest amount of probability of being the true Central Sun."

That our own sun, with our sister planets, is moving through space, has been known since the time of Herschel, and Maedler's conclusion is the result of a critical and laborious investigation of years, in regard to the so-called fixed stars, thus found to be *fixed* no longer. If this be true, then there is a new beauty and meaning in the language of Scripture, which speaks of "the sweet *influences* of

[7] We say "our firmanent," without referring to other firmaments, or stellar groups which appear in space, like those indicated by Lord Rosse's telescope.

Digitized by Google

Pleiades." But we would urge now the great fact which this hypothesis indicates — the fact of universal *order*, of the harmony of all nature. The great fact which conducts to Maedler's conclusion is the law of gravity, which, attracting the minutest atom to its mate, binds the planets to the sun, and, now it is said, all suns and planets to a common centre.

Thus reason, struggling with mystery, finds pervading the universe the evidence of one great purpose, and recognizing wisdom, benevolence and power in what it does see, is led to confide in what it does not see. Though we know but in part, yet from what we know, and because we know in part, we are called to exercise *faith*. Having reached this conclusion, we shall endeavor, in the remainder of this article, to show how nature legitimates faith, Christian faith; and condensing what may be said under this head to a single point, we shall confine our remarks to *the correspondence between nature, as illustrated by these recent discoveries, and the Christian Revelation.*

It is a vital mistake to set nature in opposition to revelation, and in our devotion to the one to undervalue the other. Yet this issue has been strikingly made. In all ages the religionist has regarded the natural philosopher with an almost instinctive aversion. In past cycles of history there have always been dread and contention at the coming in of a scientific age. And, at this day, there are those who look upon nature with distrust, and seem to fear its revelations. Now this distrust and fear, so far from being an evidence of faith, are indications of scepticism. He who trusts in the word of God knows that he will find nothing in the material universe but the will of God. He may dread the results of a partial acquaintance with nature, he may deprecate that presumption which in its irreverent haste loses the balance of accuracy; but he will welcome a really scientific age as surely hastening the work of Revealed Truth. Nature and revelation are the offspring of one Mind, a Mind of infinite wisdom and consistency, and there is an analysis in which they melt together in perfect harmony. Let us beware lest in striving for "the honor of God," we cast ourselves athwart His manifestations, and endeavor with our narrow curtain to shut out truths as vast as nature. Nor let us be so un-

Digitized by Google

believing as for a moment to mistrust that something will break out and confound our faith. Could the universe be seen in its fulness, it would not contradict the perfect fabric of the gospel. No light from any reservoir of creation shall eclipse the radiance of the Cross, but will make it stand out in more glorious relief, and crown it with a diviner lustre. We repeat, there can be no *essential* difference betwen nature and revelation. The discrepancy is is subjective, not objective — in ourselves, not in them. They are different embodiments of one essence — hemispheres which together constitute the perfect orb of truth.

But there are others, perhaps, who though they detect no heresy in nature, regard it with indifference or misappreciation. They discern nothing anti-supernatural in the fixedness of its laws, but because it lacks evangelical completeness, they consider any discourse upon it as merely sentimental — if not irreligious as unreligious. To them the pulplt seems not a proper place, nor the Sabbath a proper time, for the presentation of its truths. We cannot coincide with this idea. It is true, mere scientific statement, or intellectual appetency, is not religious, and may disturb and dry up devotion. To regard nature, as Dr. Arnold says the Pagans did the Deity, "with the same emotion one would experience in looking upon a beautiful sunset," is a factitious view to take of it either in the pulpit or out. Irreligious science, or mere æsthetical religion, is worth little. But the Bible countenances nothing like contempt of nature. "The holy men of old" drew from it illustrations of truth, incentives to devotion, and the profoundest spiritual suggestions. They thus acknowledged its essential religiousness. It is striking how spontaneously they turn to nature as a religious teacher. The material universe is mirrored upon all their pages. The sublime poetry that burns and kindles there, those passages that wrap and lift us with a power beyond any human invention, are caught from natural images, are clothed with the garments of the material world, find expression in "the riches of this great and wide sea," "the bands of Orion," the clustering Pleiades. And while the Saviour found in the lilies of the field, in the vineyard, and the mustard-seed, texts for his great themes, shall we reject the religious aspects of nature, and call a deep and devout

Digitized by Google

study of it "mere sentiment," or a discourse based upon it inappropriate to the pulpit? There are some who seem to have a very narrow notion of what they call "gospel preaching," and would confine it to textual recitation and analysis. It is our opinion that all preaching which rests upon the authority of Christ, and seeks to illustrate and apply the truths he taught, by every phenomena of being, and especially by the open handiwork of God, is gospel preaching, and as such is edifying, if it only occupies its due season. From those majestic heights and unfathomable depths, there comes an influence which lifts and purifies the soul, and which is thoroughly religious.

But we refer to this misappreciation of nature, chiefly because it overlooks the important office which nature discharges, as an illustration and aid to the Christian revelation. It is not enough to say, negatively, that nature is not hostile to revelation. We are bound to show its positive efficacy as an aid to our faith. We would remark, then, that nature corresponds with revelation in two ways. *First*, by directly corroborating it. In all the heights and depths of the universe, the eye of science discovers testimony to the great truths written in the gospel. In its unity of purpose and universal order, nature bears witness to one Creator. We find no break in the great harmony. Satellites move around planets, planets encircle suns, suns are attracted to *their* centres; but all these defer to an Infinite Intelligence. Wherever the telescope penetrates, it finds the current of that mysterious attraction which traverses all space and throbs in all life. But what is that attraction in its essence? It discovers a wonderful and all-controlling force. What is force? It ascertains the supremacy of certain laws. What are these laws of nature? The philosopher finds no answer to these questions, save that which terminates in Him whose name is stamped upon the written word — Him who was, and is, and is to come — the Almighty!

But science discovers more than this in nature. Everywhere it beholds proofs of beneficent design. The hoary fossil, down deep in the lowest strata, tells of ancient forms of being, over which presided the same creative Love, as minute in its care, as wonderful in its adaptations, as that which shines from all the sparkling coast of heaven, and

Digitized by Google

buoys up those island-firmaments which brood in the far distance as on the bosom of eternity. Indeed it is this which gives zest to the study of nature. The explorer is assured, that every vein he strikes open will reveal some new evidence of goodness, will explain some mystery, will carry out some hint, and absorb the fragmentary exception in the beauty and beneficence of a universal law. And what is this but a reiteration from nature of that crowning sentence of the apostle — "God is Love."

And the glorious revelation of immortality has its hints in nature. A prophecy of something beyond, greater, more full, more glorious, haunts every thing. It springs up irresistibly as we gaze upon those mysterious firmaments — it lingers in the whole glorious order of the heavens. Their silence is like that which closes in a great secret — a secret by and by to be revealed. We cannot forbear quoting the words of another, so beautifully has he carried out one of these suggestions or illustrations of nature. We see the stars only because the earth turns upon its own axis, and is, therefore, a part of the time averted from the sun. "It is not possible then," says Nichol,[8] "that through other conditions of the life to which we belong, and other limitations of our scheme of senses, even now we are unconscious of being engirt by other universes still more real, and as vast as the world of stars?" We quote with him the words of the poet:[9]

"Who could have thought such darkness lay concealed
Within thy beams, O Sun! or who could find,
Whilst fly and leaf and insect stood revealed,
That to such countless orbs thou mad'st us blind!
Why do we then shun death with anxious strife?
If light can thus deceive, wherefore not life?"

Secondly, Nature corresponds with revelation as a part or hemisphere, to which revelation or Christianity is the completion. After all, there is in nature a lack of definite expression. If it illustrates or suggests certain truths, they are clearly seen only through the lens of revelation; they are suggested to minds that have found them elsewhere. Without the chart of revelation we are launched

[8] System of the World, p. 37. [9] Blenco White.

Digitized by Google

out upon a sea of mystery, doubts loom up, and shadows fall, and the light of firmest faith at times flickers and goes out. We have said that nature proves a God. To the mind, in its ordinary state, unquestionably it does. But there are moods of the spirit when it is not satisfied with its own reasonings. It becomes dismayed by the mechanical regularity, the awful order of nature — the fatality that drives us irresistibly along, the silence from which we emerge and into which we vanish. We spoke of the beneficence which the scientific explorer finds everywhere. This is a cheering truth; and yet it is a *diffused* benevolence, so to speak. It is a love that shines upon the flower and the insect as upon us. Now we feel the want of a more *intense* regard — an intimate and peculiar care — a paternal affection. We are not merely as the insect and the flower — we have deep wants, yearning affections. But nature does not satisfy these. Left to that alone, there are times when we should be constrained to ask, "Does God care for us, as individuals — as men? or are we but as motes in the sunbeam, particles of the great mechanism — flakes of being, driven across the abyss of eternity?" In the doctrine of the Father, which Christianity has given us, we see the Father in nature; but without this revelation, looking back upon "the long sweep of the geological ages," and forward to those immensities of being that kindle upon the horizon of the telescope — realizing how absolutely insignificant is our position in space or time; we must feel that nature alone, as adapted to our moral wants, is an incomplete system.

So with regard to the hints of immortality which break from nature. The cultivated intellect, the highly spiritual man, may discern and feel these suggestions. But the crushed masses, the suffering, the ignorant, the vicious, need a revelation more direct and personal. As to the great question of evil, nature does not explain it. We find its solution only in "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world."

Turning, then, to Christianity, we find there that completion which we fail to discover in nature. Precisely where nature lacks, revelation supplies — wherever there is a void in the one, there is a great salient truth in the other. Nature suggests the deepest questions of the soul.

Digitized by Google

It would seem to be its office to do this, that it may thus bear witness to Christianity; for if it suggests the deepest questions of the soul, Christianity answers them. And we firmly believe that such is the beautiful correspondence between the two, that the most scientific age will be the most Christian age, and that they who see nature in its widest and grandest revelations, will also discern most clearly the spiritual riches that abound in the gospel of Jesus.

The study of nature, then, will accomplish a great work for us, if through its teachings of Mystery, Reason, and Faith, it causes us to find a deeper and more precious meaning in Christianity; — if, when dazzled by its splendor and oppressed by its immensity, it leads our faltering footsteps back to the fountain of supernatural truth, back to the simple trust of our childhood, the guide of our youth, the counsellor of our maturity, the expositor of our doubts, the near friend in our sorrows, the chart which points out the way of our duty through the midst of this crooked and deluding world, the telescope that pierces to regions beyond the sun, and shews us realities more glorious than the stars in the firmament.

And well will it be for us, if, witnessing the greatness of the work that God has wrought without us, we realize the greatness of the work that Christ accomplishes within us, and feel that we carry in our own souls the sublimest creation of the Eternal, a universe more permanent and precious than worlds. We would close with a sentiment of spiritual grandeur somewhat compatible with the material glory to which our thoughts have been directed. We take, therefore, the words of Channing: "The human soul is Christ's kingdom. There he gains his victories, there rears his temples, there lavishes his treasures. His noblest monument is a mind redeemed from iniquity, brought back and devoted to God, forming itself after the perfection of the Saviour, great through its power to suffer for truth, lovely through its meek and gentle virtues. No other monument does Christ desire; for this will endure and increase in splendor, when earthly thrones shall have fallen, and even when the present order of the outward universe shall have accomplished its work, and shall have passed away." E. H. C.

Digitized by Google

Art. II.

The False and the True Power.

The mysterious developements of this wondrous world plainly reveal the fact, that it is not governed by rude impulses and unequal exertions of power, but by laws which are constant in their influence and harmonious in their operation. The rotation and revolution of the earth are not the result of a storm pouring furiously from the depths of space, in chance and sudden shocks: those sublime motions are produced by the gentle strength and enduring principles of attraction and repulsion. Life does not come from a casual, tumultuous tossing together of chaotic materials; its stream regularly proceeds from the great Source of existence. It is not a tornado, springing from the chambers of the winds, and raging madly through the secret paths of the heavens, which binds the needle-point to the north: it is the silent but enduring power of magnetism which neither sleeps nor tires in its duty.

As it is in the physical, so in the moral world. The history of all past and present government, and the knowledge of its modes of producing submission in its subjects, prove, in the clearest words of truth, that it is not the iron arm of tyranny, crushing strokes of revenge, nor a storm of brute force, which permanently bind men to their duty, regulate the affections and joys of social life, expand and invigorate the capacities of mind, and bring nations together by the bonds of universal brotherhood and love. For physical force, acting through oppression and revenge, is a false power, because it does not produce continuous and abiding results. Its efforts are spasmodic, and drenched in blood and ruin, ending in consequences like its own hideous character, and sealing its own doom in the anarchy of its people and their fierce rage against tyrants and tyranny. Alexander the Great marched from Macedonia to India in the energy and triumph of war, ob-

Digitized by Google

tained the elements of a vast empire, and sat down in Babylon on the throne of his great dominion; yet when his career was closed by death, and the voice of the master-spirit was silenced, the unwieldy fabric was sundered into four mighty fragments. The reason of this sudden disorganization is evident. It had no true power; no essential of permanent life. It was reared in a storm of oppression and sustained by brute force. And when the hand which it passively obeyed, became palsied, it vanished like a column of mist, torn to pieces by stormy winds. The same truth has been exemplified in the present age. The pride, corruption, oppression, and wickedness which existed in France, previous to the revolution, had force to tyrannize over the people; but that force could not save the French institutions from destruction. Those institutions were shaken and overthrown, and the feeble tie which held the inhabitants together, was rent asunder. Up from the struggling and chaotic mass of people, rose men who labored to establish themselves as rulers. But they strove to govern with the false, the cruel force. Death was the guardian of their wickedness. But anarchy overcame organized tyranny. Then the "child of destiny" took his station. With consummate abilities as a statesman and a military leader, he formed the scattered fragments into a kingdom to suit himself. And when the world had submitted to the victorious legions which were led by his iron will, it appeared impossible to shake the fabric he had reared. His power was vast, but it was the power of the cannon and the sword. It was not true power. It failed. His empire passed away like a terrific comet. He died, a lone exile, on the rock of the ocean.

How different the result presented in the humbler instance which occurred in our land. The peaceful Quaker who established and became the ruler of the colony of Pennsylvania, placed the foundation of his influence and government, not on the fears, but on the affections of men. Without wielding brute force, he gained the obedience of his subjects, dispossessed the Indian of his ferocity and disarmed him of his revenge. It has been truly said, that "Penn, the great legislator of the Quakers, had the success of a conqueror, in establishing and defending his colony, among savage tribes, without ever drawing the sword; the

Digitized by Google

goodness of the most benevolent rulers, in treating his subjects as his own children; and the tenderness of a universal father, who opened his arms to all mankind without distinction of sect or party. In his republic, it was not the religious creed, but personal merit, that entitled every member of society to the protection and emoluments of the state."[1] Could this great man have been so situated as to have come in contact with vast masses of people, he would have acquired a wider sway and more lasting dominion, than Alexander attained, or Napoleon grasped. He possessed true power, the power of love, of kindness.

Man has not hitherto been governed, to any great extent, by that admirable power which subdues by right and wins by kindness. The world assents to this fact, with mournful voice. Governments have constantly resorted to brute force to compel the submission of neighboring nations, and to crush every movement of their people for casting off the galling chains of oppression. Men, asking for liberty of conscience and thought, and for exercising it, have been ferociously destroyed. Political religionists have sent out armies with professed ministers of the Saviour at their head, to kill heretics, violate their wives and daughters, murder their infants, and ravage their fields. Prisons have been built, in which criminals have been subjected to excessive flogging and starvation; and after their remaining moral feelings have been quenched in revenge, they have been sent into community like raging wolves. Insane men have been beaten, chained, starved, frozen, and treated worse than wild beasts. Children, in the family and the school, have been tormented, maimed, and their passions have been cultivated by the rod, at the expense of their moral and intellectual powers. Millions have been overwhelmed with the bitterest distress, hunger, and ignorance, that the leaders of political power and defenders of rotten institutions might be pampered with luxury and wealth. Men have been stolen and crowded into ships of war, and then treated with brutal tyranny, to make them fight their fellow-men. Armed soldiers have rioted in blood and plunder, and flooded the earth

[1] Essay on Toleration, by Arthur O'Leary.

Digitized by Google

with gore. The history of man is full of tyranny, slavery, evil. Look over the world. View its past aspect. Crowds of crusading hosts creep along in fire and destruction. Racks are full of groaning victims. Multitudes are burning at the stake, or murdered in every protracted form of suffering which malice can devise. Hundreds are strangled by the laws which involve the death-penalty. Neighbor strives against neighbor, priest against priest, nation against nation, while the ear is stunned with the groans and agony of innumerable sufferers. And yet, while dwelling in the centre of this festering mass of war, murder, rapine, cruelty, starvation, and every imaginable torture, nations and individuals have acted as though these were the results of the operation of true power, and have claimed to be Christians and the followers of the Prince of Peace, when in fact they have been guided by the principles of unmitigated revenge.

It is not in the murderous disposition of Cain, the revengeful feelings of Saul, the turmoils of the French revolution, nor in the hands of tyrants, that true power is discovered. Its holy nature and character are seen, when Joseph overcame his brethren; when David disarmed King Saul by forbearance; when suffering is removed by active benevolence; when injury is healed by goodness; when nations settle difficulties by peaceful measures; when rulers secure to their subjects the enjoyment of their rights; when the Saviour, on the cross, prayed that his foes might be forgiven. This is divine power. When its gentle hand touches the affections, and through them reaches the intellect, the soul voluntarily submits to its sway. The individual who governs by despotism, cannot produce the obedience and respect which kindness excites. Any tyrant would give half his possessions to receive the veneration from his subjects, which crowns the memory of the great and the good in all nations. Though the weapons of oppression warfare and blood, have been generally wielded in the world, and though it is almost a proverbial truth, that the name of a conquorer is synonymous with the name of one who exerts physical force to drive masses of people into slavish submission, yet greater than these is kindness. Men, though reckless of vengeance, and steeped with crime, will bow to acts of goodness. A

Digitized by Google

band of wretches, standing by the coffin of a departed philanthropist, may be made to shed tears by a description of his holy character; so true is it, that affection is a native element of the mind, as light is of the eye.

Love, affection, kindness for each other, is the key which unlocks the best feelings of the soul. It is the magnetism of the moral heavens. It is the freshening verdure of society. It is the power which binds man to his fellow. A world without kindness, unrefreshed by the dews of philanthropy, is like an earth under the influence of a perpetual storm, without a ray of the blessed sun to fall upon its frozen surface, or one green spot to cheer the sight with an oasis in its dreary desert. But when kindness goes forth in its irresistible vigor, diffuses itself in the soul, represses rude passions, and arouses the best principles of human nature, it transforms enemies into friends, disperses the clouds of revenge, and fills man with the light of benignant love. Once let the dictates of kindness be followed — once let people observe the law of doing to others as they would have others do to them, and a power would be developed which would render prisons useless, annihilate war, remove poverty and suffering, destroy slavery in all its forms, and banish enmity from the earth. That these evils now exist, proves that injustice and revenge are exerted in false power. If this false power could be driven from among men, and the true power suffered to prevail, it would effectually subdue the enemies which retard the advancement of the race.

Man possesses a nature, which can be completely controlled by the Christian force which governs without oppression and rules in the happiness and progress of its subjects. God has wrought principles of good into the texture of man's being. The light of this fact shines even from the darkest conditions of the world. However degraded people may become — however deeply they may be buried in vice and ignorance — however strongly they may be enslaved by the iron rule of barbarism — yet they will at times exhibit beautiful though faint traces of the divinity of love, proving that there are unbroken harp-strings of affection in every soul, and that they need only to be touched by knowledge and kindness, in order to give forth the strong and vivid tones of heavenly benevolence. The dim light which

Digitized by Google

history casts upon the social condition of people who have disappeared from the earth, shows, that when circumstances were favorable, the benevolent principle within has been awakened and has produced its appropriate results. The sufferings of humanity, when their voice reached the sympathizing ear of kindness, called up desire and exertion to relieve and remove them.

This benevolent feature in the nature of man, has given strength to the true power, by which people have struggled to throw off the vast oppressions which have destroyed their rights, crippled and chained their minds, and filled the earth with suffering. Though the sky has been dark, and social life has been enveloped in blackness, yet star after star has risen from the mass of evil, and ascended upward to shed its light upon the corruption and revenge which have originated so much tyranny, to develope the character of these evils, and to guide philanthropists to the field of labor for their removal. This power is increasing. For as the kindness of human nature needs cultivation, not only by direct exercise, but also by the collateral energies of increasing and general knowledge, in order to unfold its full measure of love, to bring out its long-hidden influence, and to make it the instrument which wakens the melodious song of immediate and divine communion with the God of love, so it is evident that man is rapidly attaining this cultivation and instruction. Common observation proves, that with the advance of knowledge in all its various branches, the purity and vigor of the moral sentiments have been greatly extended. The kindness of man has progressed with them — has emerged from the ignorance which contracted its power — has obtained broader fields of action; and instead of remaining a feeble, puny thing, able only to pluck up here and there a weed of suffering, has become sufficiently strong to attack the worst forms of human evil. As the sciences have advanced; as steam has been applied, in various ways, to more rapid locomotion, thus enabling people of distant nations to breathe in common the purest air of friendship; as the intellectual faculties have acquired new and growing expansion in constantly developing instruction; so those institutions and practices which are evil in their results, have become disreputable, and the benevolence of

Digitized by Google

man has everywhere attained confidence and nerve to attack them and demand their complete overthrow.

This position is evident. In past times, more enlightened views, giving greater strength to the benevolence of the soul, and guiding it to direct and appropriate results, instigated rulers, who were hurried onward by the current of events, to modify, and then to abolish, many of the vicious institutions of their day. The evil of these institutions was gradually developed. Individual after individual opened his eyes to the nature of that evil. Popular opinion became strong with growing love, and demanded its abolition. This opinion was obeyed. The evil fell, and the better was established. The work is advancing at the present day. It is but a short period since any marked exertion was made in reference to the unwise cruelties which criminals endured; to the barbarity of the death-penalty; to the baneful effects of intemperance; to the treatment of the laboring classes; to the monstrous wrong of leaving millions without the means of education; to the wickedness of persecution, in all its forms, for difference of opinion; and to other crying social vices. The few voices which were raised against these evils and which called for their destruction, were scarcely heard. The world had so grown into the spirit of revenge, that kindness was unheeded. People thought, as many now think, that the criminal and the degraded should be harshly treated — that the exercise of mercy would change such men into ferocious beasts, and take away all civil protection. But those voices gradually gained strength and vigor of utterance. They were heard farther, and listened to, more intently, by souls entering the light of nobler views of kindness. They have increased in numbers, and have become as the "sound of many waters," waking nations and men to the true glory of increasing the happiness, freedom, peace, and virtue of earth's millions. These voices are stronger in their influence and more far-reaching in their results, from the fact, that kindness has no narrow national feeling. Its power is world-wide. No matter to what nation or creed a true philanthropist may belong; his love will cause souls in all nations and creeds to throb with sympathy and benevolence. The true reformer belongs to the world. He may be an Englishman

Digitized by Google

and a Calvinist, like Howard — he may be a Frenchman and a Catholic, like Fenelon — he may be a Universalist, like Oberlin the German, or Reese the American — yet he is a son of the earth's welfare, and speaks in that voice and power of universal love, whose language is understood by every people under heaven, and is bringing them out of the confusion of Babel, that they may stand, with but one tongue and heart, at the cross of Him who tasted death for every man.

Kindness has worked out marvellous results; results as diverse from those of revenge, as peace is diverse from war. It has, in a good degree, tempered legislation with mercy; improved the condition of criminals; prepared a nobler way for the government of the insane; brought to light new modes of reforming the vicious; softened the harshness of parental and school control; enlarged the charities of the world; and has given higher and nobler views of the intercourse which should exist between nations. It has largely infused itself into the thoughts, feelings, and actions of men. It is breathing its magic influence from the silent page. By it, the revengeful is more freely giving place to the gentle. The arm, nerved for war, is gradually unbending to more peaceful pursuits. And by its sublime instruction, man, however degraded by the heavy load of error and sin, is becoming more precious in the eyes of his fellow-man, as one having claim to regard and saving action; as one who should not be neglected by society, but should be made the subject of improvement and elevation. These glorious and stirring facts prove that kindness, when it has a fair field in the drama of life, and is rightly brought to bear upon the souls of men, possesses a wonderful energy and efficacy in overcoming evil and establishing good.

From the foregoing thoughts, however imperfectly they may have been expressed, the conclusion seems evident, that the power which brute force confers, is false and productive of evil. As it is a power which depends upon bayonets, swords, and cannon, for its existence; or upon oppressive systems of government, sustained by these weapons of destruction, which bear with crushing weight upon masses of the people; or upon the exercise of revenge and enmity between man and man; it cannot be

Digitized by Google

true power. As its prevalence is productive of terrible distress; as it is the dark cavern from whence war is poured like an overwhelming deluge over the earth; as it is regardless of human life, when it has cherished objects of retaliation, or ambition, or the subjection of other nations, in view; as it is the foe of human liberty both of body and mind, and the friend of their slavery; so it is cruel power. As it always resists the demand to change corrupt institutions that better arrangements may be established; as its influence among individuals must of necessity make them bitter foes to each other; and as, when it is deprived of physical weapons and it breaks forth in the bitter words of slander, invective, and denunciation, it rouses neighbor against neighbor, sect against sect, and people against people; it must be clear that it is false power, having its origin in human passions which have subjected the intellect to their sway, and depending for its support on the ignorance and sufferings of those whom it controls. The enormous persecutions of past times — the slaughter of the Huguenots of France, and the expulsion of five hundred thousand of their number from that kingdom — dismembered Poland and her exiled sons — the millions of serfs in Russia — groaning Africa and her enslaved children — the savage exactions of criminal codes — divided communities — and an innumerable host of ghastly witnesses — all pronounce it false in words of blood and suffering. Every lover of his kind, every philanthropist, every practical Christian, will denounce it as false. Not only because it is opposed to the well-being of the world; not only because it is opposed to the spirit and teachings of Christianity; but because it produces its like, increases its own hateful progeny, and multiplies itself in the lust of revenge, and is every way productive of evil, and only evil.

On the contrary, kindness, subduing the passions and using enlightened intellect as the instrument of its application, is true and sublime power. The influence which brings nations nearer to each other in the spirit of universal brotherhood, and thereby makes them less liable to engage in war, and disposes them to settle any difficulties which may occur, in peace and justice, must be holy and excellent. The power which disposes governments to cast away whatever is oppressive in their organization, and to

Digitized by Google

adopt measures which improve and elevate the people — which induces millions of men, who unite in demanding their rights, to do so, not in fire and blood, but by the use of moral means — must be of the noblest order. The power which could awaken and save thousands of intemperate men who were deemed past cure — which can subdue and reform the hardened criminal; and when it uses physical force, only does so, that the subject may be placed within reach of reconciliation — which can remove the bitterness of enemies, excite peace among neighbors, quell the horrors of persecution and the denunciations of sectarism, and diffuse its gentle influences throughout entire communities — must be admirable and full of blessing. Every friend of quiet and order; every lover of the race; every son of benevolence; every person who has been taught in the school where the spirit of Christ prevails; will pronounce it to be from God and therefore best fitted for men. This is the power which ought to be universally prevalent in the human family, not only because it is an emanation from God; not only because it is the spirit of Christianty; not only because it is gentle and full of good fruits; but because it multiplies itself in peace, and in its increase makes the desert of ignorance, sin, and suffering smile with the freshening verdure of virtue and love.

In the past ages of the world, it was not possible, probably, for kindness to obtain general sway. Men were too much under the rule of passion, and had not emancipated themselves sufficiently from the spirit of revenge, to appreciate the power of love in its most broad and generous influence over the soul. Slavish fear, originating in the exercise of brute force, was deemed the true chain to bind men to obedience. But circumstances are altering; the clouds of revenge are scattering; and people are entering into the light where they see this important truth, as expressed in the language of another: "Love is the weapon which Omnipotence reserved to conquer rebel-men, when all the rest had failed. Reason he parries. Fear he answers blow for blow. Future interest he meets with present pleasure. But Love, that sun, against whose melting beams, winter cannot stand; that soft, subduing slumber which wrestles down the giant; there is not one creature

Digitized by Google

in a million; not a thousand men in all the earth's quintillion, whose clay heart is hardened against Love." [2]

From these considerations we conclude that *Revenge* is the *false*, and *Kindness* the *true Power*. G. W. M.

Art. III.

Man's Position in the Scale of Being.

Able articles have been published in the Review, touching the *origin* and the *uses* of evil. The present object, though necessarily connected with these points, will be to show, rather by fact and inference, as briefly as we may, that man is the only being in creation capable of committing sin. This view, we think, may be fully sustained by glancing at the position occupied by man among other beings.

The scale of created beings must have been full and complete, from the highest to the lowest; or the evidence upon which we now rely, that God is infinitely good, would have been imperfect and unsatisfactory. Had God chosen not to create a single intelligent being, the fact would have proved his goodness defective. Had He chosen to create the angels or spiritual beings in heaven, without creating men, his goodness would still have been imperfect. Had He created angels and men, without filling up the scale down to the minutest insect, his goodness would then have been less than it now is. Or had He made the whole animated creation precisely the same as now, but without providing for the continuance, sustenance, and progressive improvement of the whole, then also his goodness would have fallen short of the infinite. But it was not so. The Deity saw, in the beginning, where goodness might erect an altar to itself; and, and in the work of creation, every vacancy was filled. Thus we see the

[2] M. F. Tupper.

Digitized by Google

great chain of existence, from the very lowest to the very highest of beings, and thus do we find man, combining the animal and spiritual natures, at about mid-distance, in the moral sense, between earth and heaven.

Turn we now to the position occupied by man; with especial reference to the error and sin of the present life.

We are not in the habit of regarding the brute as morally responsible for what it does or what it leaves undone. The animal creation is, however, subject to the laws governing the physical being. God has given the animal an instinct, which guides to food, and teaches the necessity of avoiding danger. So far, the accountability of the brute corresponds with the physical accountability of man. But in addition to that, man is accountable in a moral sense, by the test of right and wrong. He has within, what the brute has not, a monitor, which, if he would be happy, must be obeyed. The distinction between right and wrong, of christian ethics, the brute has no knowledge of; from this fact, he is not believed to be accountable, in the moral sense of the term; and hence, as we are in the habit of saying, the brute, however cruel or mischievous he may be, is not capable of committing intentional sin. The brute creation, therefore, embracing all the animated beings below man, in the estimation both of God and men, cannot be regarded as sinners.

The being we call man, however, is capable of knowing and pursuing the right; and in so far as he does not do so, he may, with propriety, be termed a sinner. Man's position in the scale of being, when compared with that of any other creature, is peculiar. Although all created beings are necessarily finite, he alone is surrounded by circumstances, which if not well understood, lead him into temptation and sin. For instance: Man, while in the body, must have food and drink; and the excessive gratification of that desire, leads him into gluttony and drunkenness — two dreadful sins of the present life. But could man be guilty of those sins, if he possessed not the desire of bodily nourishment? Of course not. Well, "flesh and blood" cannot inherit the life to come; man's present bodily desire for nourishment cannot go with him into the purely spiritual existence; and if this be so, then all the sins of the present life, which result from the excessive

Digitized by Google

gratification, or misdirection, or non-satisfaction, of the desire for food and drink, must of course be excluded from the future state. Take another example: Many of the sins of the present life — avarice, theft, robbery, murder, &c. — not unfrequently result from abuses of the earthly desire for gain. This is perfectly self-evident. But if man were freed from that desire, as he surely will be in the world of spirits — where articles of gain do not exist, and where it would not be needed — then, of course, all the sins resulting from the improper gratification of that desire, would cease with man. These illustrations clearly teach the lesson, that of all the beings of God's creation — though all are finite and imperfect — man alone is liable to temptation and sin. We have seen that sin is not chargeable against the brute: we see that the sin of this life arises only from the abuse of desires, which are in themselves good, and which are peculiar to the earth alone; and the unavoidable inference is, that when the soul of man shall be separated from the body, and pass into the future spiritual state — though it must still be finite and imperfect — yet all occasions or temptations to sin must have forever passed away.

And when we take into consideration the fact, that the future existence is of a purely spiritual nature, and that all beings above man are entirely destitute of bodily appetites and passions; we can but see, that the causes of sin which exist here, will not exist there, and that angelic natures cannot be subject, like man, to temptations and sins. This supposition is perfectly consistent with the truth, that all beings but God are finite and imperfect. We may suppose an angel to be less than infinite, without necessarily supposing him positively sinful. To know *only* truth, and do *only* right, is one thing; but to mistake error for truth, and to do evil in the place of good, is quite another. The former is the condition of the higher spiritual beings; while the latter is that of man. Though all beings below God are finite and imperfect, yet no being but man is sinfully so. The angels maintain their innocence because they are not surrounded by the temptations of earthly life. And when man becomes as the angels in heaven are, he will be free to rise in knowledge and holiness forever, and his measure of happiness will ever be the exact measure of his truth and love.

Digitized by Google

Here I would have it noticed, that where temptation and sin do not fetter the action of the spirit, the law of progress in knowledge and holiness is strictly obeyed by it. Every mind, even in the vestment of mortality, if not completely under the bondage of passion, gains, by its action, truth after truth continually. Observation and reflection add to the fund of truth, even of the most experienced, if virtue be the guide. And even the most vicious and depraved, though perhaps making no progress in truth and holiness here, yet, when freed from earthly desires and passions at death, must then commence the great march of the soul, in the knowledge and holiness of the Lord. The idea I wish to convey is, that every intelligent being which God has made, though finite, must, taking all duration together, render strict obedience to the law of progressive truth and love.

From the position which man occupies in the scale of being; his blending the qualities of earth and heaven; the origin of his sins; and the absolute certainty of their being left behind at death; we see that he is the only being in creation which does or can sin — and he, only because of his earthly nature and earthly circumstances.

And now, by way of inference from our subject, I would ask, Does it look reasonable that God would make such a universe as this, the chain of being extending from himself down to naught, all so admirably sustained and continued, beautiful beyond conception, and far more good than beautiful — with man, the only being inclined to commit sin, and that because of temptations and circumstances, which were thrown about him without his choice; does it look reasonable, or does it accord with Scripture, that so weak and imperfect and helpless a being as man, who cannot well help sinning sometimes, should incur infinite and never-ending loss, because of his sins during the earthly life? Would it not be the most dreadful tyranny on the part of the Creator, to treat his creatures thus? Why could he not have left the sphere occupied by man, a total blank in creation, rather than have filled it up with certain subjects of endless torture? Is God so partial that he placed no occasions of sin in the way of the angels; and made the brutes devoid of moral accountability; and yet gave man a nature subject to

Digitized by Google

temptation and placed temptations or occasions of temptations all about him, which feeble man could not avoid; and at the same time made endless torment the consequence of human transgressions? Surely this is a reproachful conception of the character and doings of God! Whoever believes it, in real earnest, I feel confident cannot render true worship to the God he owns.

But the object contemplated in this brief article is accomplished. We have furnished our hint, and if some abler pen shall be induced thereby to take up and prolong the theme, a double purpose will have been gained.

J. J. A.

Art. IV.

Christian Consolations.

1. Sermons of Consolation, by F. W. P. Greenwood, D. D. Boston: Little & Brown, 1842.

2. Christian Consolations. Sermons designed to furnish comfort and strength to the Afflicted, by A. P. Peabody. Boston: Crosby & Nichols, 1847.

3. The Crown of Thorns; a Token for the Sorrowing, by E. H. Chapin. Boston: Abel Tompkins, 1847.

No department of religious literature has been so little attended to as the Consolatory. The collection of all "tokens for the sorrowing" would be but small, and yet a few only of that very limited number would be found to answer the wants of the afflicted. We hail the appearance of such volumes as those before us. Their mission is of the tenderest and holiest nature; and many a bereaved and lone spirit will own them as gifts from "God, our Maker, who giveth songs in the night," and causeth "among the multitude of our thoughts his comforts to delight the soul." All submission and resignation comes from right discipline of the thoughts — thoughts that sway the spirit as the tides the sea, and make deep call unto deep, in the mystery of the night of evil. *Time* is not, as

Digitized by Google

many exalt it, the Consoler. It may blunt the sensibilities; and nature, by her own recuperative energies, may restore the balance of the feelings, so that we weep not as we have wept for "the bitterness of death." But this is not consolation, and no touch of healing has been felt. "Time and *good thoughts*," said a bereaved one, to a friend who bade him take heart, — as time would do away with his grief. And to give these "good thoughts" we have need of volumes of consolation, imbued with the spirit of true theology, and rich with the unction of Christian sympathy, that can be taken by the mourner at night, in the solemn stillness of solitude, and so communed with, that the awakening griefs of widowed love may be soothed to rest.

These volumes will give some valuable hints to the many ministers who complain of the monotony of sermons designed to be consolatory, and who are disinclined to make any farther public use of the bereavements which occur in their parishes than what may be done in the prayers of the sanctuary. They will here see that no department of sermonizing is capable of being more diversified than this, and none can better exhibit the fruits of thoughtful interest in the welfare of the people. Some, indeed, make the topics of the pulpit, in this portion of the minister's labor, wanting in variety, by a perpetual recurrence simply to true and false views of death, and the fulness of this great hope. Their consolatory sermons are all *funeral* sermons; and they sometimes apologize to the people for preaching what they feel will be of little general interest, by specifying a particular request. Others, with indiscriminating impartiality, limit their efforts to a fulsome eulogy of the dead, and remind us of Charles Lamb's visit to the grave-yard, where he read only of loving husbands, affectionate wives, and dutiful children. And still others confine themselves to elaborate efforts to touch every painful chord by delineating the extent of the loss in the departed, how the dead will be missed, and make the shroud, the coffin, and the tomb, most prominent of all the visions that pass before the imagination. There is a great want of delicate discernment in preachers. Many seem to have no faculty to individualize mourners — to sympathize with the peculiarities of their grief, and to

Digitized by Google

meet *the* wants of suffering love. They give too little study to this department of labor, and are constantly repeating themselves. One great reason for this is, they think little or nothing of any other form of affliction than the bereavements of death. They have no idea what a prominent element suffering is in the life of every people — how great is the variety of causes that make the hearts faint, the hands droop, and the knees bend in weakness and pain. Much, we know, depends upon the mental habitude of the minister, the liveliness of his sympathies, and the character of his parochical intercourse with his people. Some know little because they are capable of drawing out but little, and never become the spiritual friend into whose heart is poured the whole burden of oppressive grief. There is no vein in their sermons that opens up to individuals evidence that their sorrows are remembered beyond the passing time of private communion. No little word, no indirect remark, no comparison or illustration, is dropped as rain into the heart of the flower, reviving its very being, while all around is blessed with the shower. Preaching is thus made a form, rather than a life; and though intended for all, it comes home to none.

Pain, suffering, and grief fill a large space in the world's history. From the first tears of Eden to the sorrows around us, suffering has been continued; and in the happiest of eras, man has felt a deep necessity to find in philosophy and religion a comforter. How has man borne the vicissitudes of his lot? — has always been an absorbing question, and our whole nature makes answer that it is truly a sublime thing "to suffer and be strong." Heroism is in nothing better exhibited than in the struggle with suffering; and among the historic pictures that fill the imagination, there are none to which we turn with more intensity of thought and feeling than to such. Poetry and art have glorified the sufferer; and the canvass and the marble speak, with irresistible eloquence, of the martyrdom which souls have endured, for great principles and faith in divine things. On the ear of humanity drop no words of deeper pathos than when the story is told of suffering bravely borne, the noble mastery which mind has achieved over circumstances and times. There seems something of the God in all this. What has made the

Digitized by Google

mind such a victor? This is the question — a question for all ages, for all souls. Suffering is everywhere. Its causes may come from quarters where we least dream it can generate; and look as we will on life, it is impossible not to see its presence, and be at times appalled by its magnitude. It tears from some the little virtue they possessed, and to others it gives the majesty of true royalty of soul. Some it darkens — others it glorifies. It is like night, to which it is so often compared, — sometimes all gloom, making us wait in terror for the coming of the morning; and again, so full of starry revelations, that we only note the absence of the sun, and rejoice that it is hidden for the time. Through the shifting and parting clouds of smoke, where the flames are consuming the steam-ship, with its burden of hundreds of souls, how different the sights we see! Not all angel faces peering upon us as the floating veils move to and fro, speaking of heaven and its sublime rest; but haggard and awful features, grown old in an hour, are there, that make us shrink away and desire to blot out the memory of what we have seen. Behind this difference lies thought, moving the springs of hope and fear, and revealing itself in the outward looks — calm and majestic as the front of Jove, timid and crouching as the crushed slave. With this power of thought religion is to deal, and the test of faith and hope lies in the character of the results achieved. Is our faith sufficient for our needs? Have we "everlasting consolation and good hope, through grace?" Are we "comforted in all our tribulation," so that we are "able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God?" Amid the rushing and warring "multitude of our thoughts," do "the comforts of God delight our souls?" Is the spirit of truth to us the comforter?

Yes, in the light of our interpretation of the divine Record, *all truth* is a comforter. We hesitate not to express our conviction, that the proper conception of things in any department of reality, is comforting. We fear no advance of science and philosophy; no penetration into the secrets of nature; no adventure to which mind may give itself in the exploits of curiosity; and at no step of inquiry do we let down the veil of a mystic theology, and forbid progress. To us the prophecy of "a better time is com-

Digitized by Google

ing," is more than the burden of a song for the popular breath and ear; it is a profound conviction, animating every energy of thought, and bidding the soul on, on to victory. "Things are not what they seem." And if the ancients erred when they dreamed that "the toad, ugly and venomous, wore a precious jewel in its head," yet the comparison of adversity to such an aspect and a hidden beauty was just; and with the deepest reverence and the highest joy, we can say, as "we walk by faith," "God Almighty! there is a soul of good in evil things, would men observingly distil it out." The soul of things is the great object of research; and when once the idea is fixed in the heart, that all truth is a comforter, that as we get at God's view of things, we shall be blessed, — then progress becomes the exultant cry of the strong-hearted adventurers; and theology, instead of impeding the advance of mind, breathes a quickening energy into every fibre of man's being. Christian literature has been so little fruitful in consolations, because of the deep and miserable want of faith in God, or in man — in the good of the present, or the future. Hope has of late become a more prominent element in the thoughts of men, because the social era has dawned. With love, dawns faith; and from faith springs hope; and hope inspires the loftiest heroism. Where the great demand of Christianity for a world-wide love is heeded, there springs an asking for some vision of good towards each soul embraced in this circle of love, whenever the purposes of God are contemplated. Where God fixes uualterable love, we may; and however repulsive the sight of the prodigal, if God says, "Son, give me thy heart!" we must ask, "Brother, give me thy love!" and as God acts to get the gift for which he asks, so should we labor.

Thus we make Christian consolations to have many and wide-reaching relations. Not only when we behold the loved one lying panting at the vestibule of eternity, or when the unseen has enwrapt him, do we need consolation; but from the birth of thought, through all its journeyings, in all the relations of trembling expectancy and doubt — in all the variety, that makes up the vicissitudes of life. In no portion of the mind's pilgrimages, do we want to "beat the air" and cry, "It is all dark,

Digitized by Google

dark, dark to my soul and I cannot disguise it!" We want an impulsive and yet fixed hope, like the heart that keeps its due place in the system, yet sends the blood on its rushing or flowing way as the needs of life and health may be, involuntarily, and revealing by the pulse, at any time, the quickening of arterial action.

One excellence of the volumes before us is, that they present, at the first glance, evidence that this fact has been heeded. Death and dying, the grave and eternity, are not the only and continued themes, — great, awful and momentous though they be, demanding the attention of every rational being. We welcome any aids that open the means of giving new attraction and power to the pulpit, enlarging its variety, while its usefulness is at the same time increased. These volumes will do this; and we would specially commend them, in this light, to our brethren in the ministry. It is true, as expressed in the preface to Mr. Greenwood's volume: "The great sources of consolation are but few, and remain the same from year to year and age to age; because they are sufficient for their end, and for our condition." And so with any science, of almost infinite relations, the great principles are few. The glory of inventive genius is seen in the new applications of those few principles, creating as great wonder now as when the first developements were made. As the study of planetary perturbations "led to the discovery of a new planet, so right dealing with moral perturbations will lead to new spheres of truth, new worlds of consolation. A happy faculty for giving new terms to Scripture ideas, throwing around a familiar passage new interests, is one of the best gifts for the preacher. To secure attention is the first requisite in pleading any cause; and this is to be done, in behalf of the greatest of all concerns, not by fanciful paradoxes, nor by ringing many changes on a few words, but in a manner suited to the dignity of the pulpit and the solemn character of the services of the sanctuary. In one sense, the preacher should be a poet — as in olden time, poet and prophet were one — carrying the mind beyond the surface of things, and comforting the heart by the assurance that though there be but a handful of corn scattered in the earth on the top of the mountain, yet the fruit thereof shall shake like the majestic cedars of Leba-

Digitized by Google

non. Thus he may gratify and cultivate the love of the beautiful, give language to thought and emotion, interpret man to himself, and minister to the highest culture of which humanity is capable. The pulpit has but little power compared to what it might exert. It is too little consolatory — too much depressing. It is not enough inspired with the divine spirit of the prophet of Nazareth, when he read his mission on the scroll that told of binding up the broken-hearted and comforting all that mourn. Christ has the spirit of the consolations he offered, and hence the infinite gentleness with which he treated sorrow and grief, imbuing the soul with that humility which is essential to all enduring exaltation.

In Mr. Greenwood's volume we find this exquisite tenderness, with a delicacy of feeling the most acute; and a strength of thought in combination with beauty of diction, as remarkable as it is delightful. He was a sufferer. He looked into his heart and wrote, because in his heart was a genuine Christian experience. He was induced to publish "chiefly by the desire of being yet heard by the people of his ministry, though withheld by the hand of Providence from addressing or meeting them in church." His desire that his volume might be received with favor and do some service beyond the bounds of his parish, was fully answered ere he was called away. The variety of topics, which he makes to bear upon the aim to impart consolation, is great. He shows how effectually this end can be obtained by treating upon subjects which, in many other hands, would assume only a controversial or merely an intellectual character. Take the second sermon, "God Incomprehensible." This attribute is treated of in reference to his nature, and the ways of his Providence — in the modes of his existence, and in the modes of his government — because he is invisible, eternal, omnipotent, and infinite. We trouble our hearts because we cannot understand his ways and doings, and how should we? Our ignorance is our bliss, for were he not so great, we could not so trust. Here, from one of the themes that oftener than otherwise bring a pressure upon the intellect, he deduces a source of consolation; and we turn from being oppressed with our ignorance, to thankfulness for the greatness on which we can lean. The vine ceases to droop and bleed, because it can cling to the

Digitized by Google

oak and aspire. "Yet more we are permitted to know, for our encouragement, in the gospel of Christ; to know that not eternal wisdom alone, but infinite and impartial love presides over the universe; that we are in the hands of a Father, who, with more than an earthly parent's tenderness and solicitude provides for the wants and hearkens to the cries of all his children."—p. 24.

So also with the attribute of Power, — "God All-Powerful." How often this is made to oppress, while the mind is directed to a contemplation of the terrific agents in nature. "Twice have I heard this, that power belongeth unto God." Nature hath spoken it, and revelation hath repeated the speech. We have heard it from history — we have listened to it as uttered by the still, small voice of experience. Once when, in childhood we trembled at the rolling and shattering thunder, and again as knowledge opened to manhood the mighty agencies at work in the universe. From the past comes this voice — the present repeats it; aye, and the future is ready with its echoing response. Mr. Greenwood takes this theme, "God All-Powerful." He shows how the first impression of "the works of nature and the broad ranges of the universe, is that of power." Soon design is perceived — evidences of a mind at work; and remembering the caution of infidelity not to be credulous, he resolves not to be, and finds, in order not to be credulous, he must resolve the problem, Whence were these, and by whom are they? by adoring faith in the Christian's God. And then his power is seen in life, its beginning, its continuance, the events that form its changes and vicissitudes, and in its close.

"We are very proud sometimes; and we talk boastfully of what we have done, and what we intend to do; but when gray hairs are scattered over our foreheads, we cannot bring the youthful color to their roots again; and when the mists of age begin to fall over the delicate orbs of sight, we find that with all our strength we cannot brush those little mists away. Forward and upward, and still forward, but downward, we are borne along, and we should strive as fruitlessly to resist the hand which impels us, as to check the flowing, or hinder the ebbing tides."—p. 31.

This awe-inspiring view of God's power, that makes us hold our breath in the hushed stillness of our thoughts, is

Digitized by Google

clothed with beauty at once, as the entering sunshine lights up the forest, — Infinite power and infinite mercy are lodged in the same hands, never to be divided, never to be alienated. I remember how this thought once struck me with a force which will never cease its consoling action on my soul, and has made me love dearly our view of Christian consolations. A pious Episcopalian was addressing, from my pulpit long years ago, the people on the evils of intemperance. He drew a graphic picture of the downward course of the drunkard, and when at last he was before us pale and rigid in death, he forebore to speak farther than to say, — "We leave him, knowing that as, in all existence, he must be upheld by the power of God, he cannot be beyond the reach of his mercy." Praise to that arm of power! strong to save, because tender to embrace, — that lies about the soul, like attraction about the globe, affixing the restraint that secures freedom and safety.

Whatever theme is treated in this volume, the tone and spirit are the same, showing that the subject was not the source of inspiration to the preacher, but the habitude of the soul, the lofty conceptions of God and his dealings. From James v. 13, he beautifully lays down the basis of the whole. The sentiments and principles of religion, present in the sad and joyous conditions of life; in affliction, pray; in cheerfulness, sing. Sorrow should always have its prayer, and joy its hymn. Here at once is true philosophy employing true religion. Earth is not made a vale of tears, that we may be so dissatisfied with it as to wish to be delivered from it; but it is a place in which to sing, and to so sing that we may pray the better. Visible life hath in itself a worthiness, and we are so to prepare for the changing conditions to which we are subject, that in gladness we may not forget our prayers, nor in sorrow our hymns.

"If we begin with the first steps and principles of our religion, we shall perceive comfort and consolation broadly and intelligibly marked upon them all. Contemplate the divine attributes: contemplate them one by one. How strongly does each impress the mind with the sentiment of relief and support!"—p. 109.

Our author makes those attributes a high source of consolation by presenting "God the Guardian of Souls."

Digitized by Google

"All souls are mine, saith the Lord." His right in and over them is asserted, that it may be felt and pondered, and lead to that "subjection to the Father of spirits" which secures the best improvement of life. Beautiful is the apostrophe.

"Watchman of Israel! who never slumberest nor sleepest, thou compassest my path and my lying down; thou art the guardian of my soul while my tired head is on the pillow, and my judgment, like an over-wearied sentinel, is drooping unconsciously at its post; thou knowest the way that I take when I know it not myself, and when I am awake, I am still with thee!"—p. 45.

"All souls are in the hand of their keeper and Defender. Not one is excepted. God preserves the roaming, irresponsible soul, through all its aberrations, and, notwithstanding the outward signs of loss, saves all its faculties, and permits not a fraction of its integrity to be dissolved. Of this truth he often affords us the most convincing proofs. Often does the soul, which has been untuned for years, utter in the last moments of mortality, the clear notes of restoration and praise. Often does the soul, which, for a melancholy time has seemed to be shattered, broken down and undone, rise up just as it is called to quit the infirm body, rise up in the wholeness and freshness of former days, show how safely it has been led, and held by the Almighty arm, and then resign itself to its God. So manifestly does the Father of spirits vindicate the truth of his declaration, 'All souls are mine.' They cannot stray from under his eye; they cannot be lost from his care."—pp. 47, 48.

The soul's ignorance of itself, its weakness in and by itself, are set forth not to overwhelm us with our littleness, but to awaken in us a consciousness of our high powers and higher destiny. We feel that we are something when God claims us as his, and throws such marvellous agencies of salvation around us in his gracious guardianship.

"'Behold,' says the Eternal, 'all souls are mine.' 'Yea!' respond our souls, from the deep places of their ignorance, and with all the voices of their wants—'Yea! all souls are thine!' Thou art their Father, Owner, Keeper. The souls of the lofty and the lowly, of the wealthy and the poor, of the happy and the sorrowful—all souls are thine. In the feebleness of childhood, and the feebleness of age; in clouds and darkness, and weariness; from the first moment of their existence, to the last of their sojourn

Digitized by Google

in clay; in their searchings after thee, and departures from thee, and whether they know thee or know thee not, all souls are thine!'"—p. 49.

How well can the preacher go on to speak of "The Folly of Atheism," that tells us our prayer goes up into empty space, and our praise explodes as glittering bubbles from the child's pipe;—that resolves the deity into an impersonal principle, and assures us we all are orphans. The idea of God, as Christianity gives it to us, "is an idea, a conviction, a faith, so full of majesty, of love, of hope, of power and protection, so pre-eminently the light of our mental and moral being, that we would lose anything, suffer anything, rather than part with it; and are unable to believe that they who renounce it and contend against it, are in possession of even a tolerably well-guided understanding."—pp. 51, 52.

Then comes naturally the desire to be ever conscious of his Presence — of "Dwelling in the Temple," to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire for truth and duty in all their manifold relations. "Death an Appointment," then becomes the theme, as we think of the seeming interruption to the high privilege of dwelling ever in the temple. We *must* die, that is certain; but our thoughts should not be limited to the simple fact, and rest in the idea of fate, but should go on to the discernment of it as an appointment, and thus see an intelligent purpose — looking beyond the terror of its aspect, to the wisdom and love that ordained it. "It is appointed by the same Being who opens our eyes upon the glories of this marvellous world, and is the author of all the happiness we have ever enjoyed. It is appointed by the same being who rules the universe in all its movements, and throughout all its extent. Let it come, then, at whatever season, in whatever mode, it cannot come without the cognizance of that knowledge which precludes the supposition of error, and of that mercy on which every doubt and every sorrow may lean."—(p. 75.) It admits of all the comforts which a consideration of the attributes of our Father affords. "The pains and sicknesses of the body, the infirmities and errors of the mind, the wanderings and excessess of the passions, are all the sources of many and great sorrows, and of sins, which are sorrows also. But these sources of sorrow be-

Digitized by Google

long to the limited condition of life, and will stop when that condition ends. Their purpose is no doubt disciplinary and useful; but it is consoling to be assured that they will be brought to a close, by the closing of that temporary arrangement from which they arise, and to which they are bound."—(p. 79.) But the question will arise, Is not Death the author of other and overwhelming sorrows? We must answer, It is the author of many and poignant griefs, "for to love here on earth, is indeed to prepare the way for sorrow, for all who love must be parted by the great appointment. But death is appointed to put an end also to this sorrow. It is appointed to put an end to that state which requires death. Its first, last, and only act, is to open a scene of things in which its own power is forever abdicated."—p. 80.

Fitting in this regular series of sermons — at whatever distance of years they were written — is "The Time of Death." "A Time to die" there is, but no regular, fixed period is revealed. Graves are of all lengths; and to death belong all seasons. "The day will come when the principle of selection will be unfolded," and we shall see why one is taken to be "educated altogether in heaven," and another dwells on earth till a century is completed. Much "for the satisfaction of our reason and the consolation of our heart," may be learned by a wise consideration that will enable us "to perceive in many of the varieties of the time of death, wise reasons for each dispensation, and signs of the benevolence of Him, in whose hands alone is the time to die."—(p. 85.) With this thought in mind, it is well to go to "The House of Mourning," there to be impressed with the uncertainty of life, humbled by a sense of our dependence, and chastened by the solemn reflections which are there suggested. We seek then "The Consolations of Religion," which really "form a delightful and almost inexhaustible theme of contemplation and discourse. The more they are considered, the more full and abundant do they appear."—(p. 108.) We joy in God, because we see there is no limit to consolation, as immortality shows us still cared for of God. Death does not "arrest us from his guardianship, and put a dark and final close to our connection with his spirit. But after what Christianity taught us of the Creator, we may

Digitized by Google

venture to say it was impossible that it should not have also taught the immortality of his intelligent creatures. It does teach with perfect distinctness that glorious, and, as we may call it, finishing truth, that the existence of man will be commensurate with the existence of God; that the love and the truth and protection which the great Father now exercises toward his children, will lead them through the gate of death; and that the communion which he now holds with them, intimate as it is, will be yet more close and sensible, when the Lamb shall walk with their refined and beautified spirits through the bowers of an eternal Eden, and the golden streets of the heavenly Jerusalem. This is giving the seal of eternity to all that is compassionate and soothing and exalting in our knowledge of God. This is the key-stone which locks and binds together the grand arch of Christian consolation."—(p. 116.) With this divine hope, we can but readily yield to the duty of "Blessing God in Bereavement." It is easy to bless him when life is bright and joyous, but when our cup is dashed or overflows with bitterness, this duty is more difficult of performance; yet if well performed, it shall then have a higher action on the soul. Let this be tested at the death of friends, "that death may be significant of gain, much rather than of loss, to the departed and the bereaved; that while it strikes with one hand, it quickens, renews, and transforms with the other."—(p. 121.) "An exchange of worlds is best even for those who have grossly abused the present life; because it is well known to infinite Wisdom, when the time of probation has been sufficiently extended, when the souls of friends have been sufficiently tried, and when the discipline and awards of another scene should in their deep mystery be commenced."—pp. 121, 122.

Here is a point where we cannot but be solicitous to obtain the whole meaning of our author. All, thus far, has been consistent, beautiful, and consoling. It has harmonized in letter and spirit with the faith he once eloquently argued, that endless evil could not exist under the government of God. We have promise all along that the higher and better phase of Unitarianism, which results from bravely following out great principles to their legitimate issues, would present itself, and shall we be disappointed? We think not, but will wait patiently to see.

Digitized by Google

He dwells on the death of the good, and naturally takes up as the next topic, "Remembrance of the Righteous." Then "Nothing without Christ," which earnestly claims for the Saviour the dignity that belongs to him. The branch, if it would have strength, beauty, and fruitfulness, must preserve intimate union with the vine, or stock. To adopt this idea, and so carry out its force of meaning, is to take the high ground occupied by the true spiritualist. And yet it has been said of these sermons, that "in what they say of Christ, we are not quite satisfied. We feel as if their philosophy were not broad and deep enough to take in as it ought the mysteries of the Saviour's kingdom, and his influence on man."—(*Christian Examiner*, vol. 36, 242.) They give, it is thought, imperfect views concerning the spiritual union of Christ and humanity. We do not perceive this. Such a volume was no place for metaphysics, in which to strike the precise difference between what was discarded of the old and repulsive doctrines of vicarious atonement, and the pure truth of the simplicity that is in Christ. But as far as his themes led him, the preacher has spoken in harmony with the Gospels. He has admitted a mystical union with Christ, but from its very nature it cannot be defined, no more than we can define spirit and matter in all their distinctions as existing in man. We think we see of late a tendency among Unitarians towards *cant* — the putting forth of claims to be considered *evangelical* in a sense that would make others among themselves odious. "I am an Evangelical Unitarian," sounded queerly to many ears that have heard it. There was an odor about it not pleasant. How broad and deep must that philosphy be which will "take in the mysteries of the Saviour's kingdom, and his influence on man"? What are those mysteries? What is that influence? There is a vagueness in the language of such criticism that impels the question, What is meant? but affords no satisfaction. By the eternal grace of God, there is, as we believe, a spiritual union between Christ and humanity, as truly as that of soul and body, the Deity and the universe; and in this union is secured the ultimate complete efficiency of the Saviour's mediation. We cannot define it. From its nature, it precludes definition. Mysteries cease to be such as soon as we can define them; and

Digitized by Google

that philosophy which plants itself on the great principle of the Father's infinite love, and sees in all things tokens of interest in man because of this love, and beholds him overruling, in the supremacy of wisdom and power, every thing for final good to each and all of his intelligent creatures, *is* broad and deep enough to take in all the mysteries of the Saviour's kingdom, and his influence on man; because such a philosophy views him promised, sent, and exalted, for the accomplishment of the great purpose of creating, preserving, and redeeming love. That philosophy which does not connect him with a certain result; which makes him but an example; a great mind of the past; one among many of earth's illustrious personages whom history ought to preserve, even though there is a little of the myth about the story of their lives, — is indeed not broad or deep enough for a true Christian faith to live in. The consolations of Christianity that circle around Christ, receive their light and beauty from him, because of his position as "the Saviour of the World," in the high sense that embraces an absolute result commensurate with the extent of the meaning of that sublime title. With unwavering confidence we can speak with our author in his next sermon of the "Perpetuity of Christ's Kingdom." "Other kingdoms shall change and perish; other governments shall be destroyed; the old sound of crushing thrones has not ceased; they have been falling in our own times all around us, and others will fall in the times that are coming after us. The kingdom of Christ is not dependent upon them, and will not fall with them. Nor will it pass away, though some of the forms and institutions which men have connected with it, should be laid aside. These things are not the substance of Christianity, and Christianity cannot be disturbed by their alteration. He who considers the foundations of the Messiah's kingdom, will see that they do not consist in these things, but are the same with the foundations of the eternal throne. Thy throne is God, forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre."—p. 167.

Having lifted the soul to such a moral height, he would not have it descend and seek from man what can only come from God. Hence he treats of "Independence on Human Sympathy." Jesus was not insensible to human

Digitized by Google

sympathies. He loved, and sought love. But the desertions of those from whom he had a right to expect the most abiding and active sympathy did not overcome him. He knew he was liable to receive such treatment, and keen as he felt it, he ruled it. "And yet I am not alone," said he; "because the Father is with me." And nothing is more intimately connected with our happiness, especially when we need consolation, than to set a proper limit to our expectations from the sympathy of others. How important is this truth to the minister! How cold to the warm-hearted and enthusiastic youth, ere experience has sobered his glowing hopes of co-operation in every good work, comes the withholding of that sympathy which is essential to success! It is as the frost to the blooms of spring. The minister is much alone. He is often an afflicted and bereaved soul, deprived of the hope that seemed the most rational. "The heart knoweth its own bitterness," and it only adds to the amount of its sorrows if it forgets this fact, and expect from others what cannot be received. A holier and mightier than man must be sought for,—One who is "greater than our heart, and knoweth all things." He who is the guest of God can spare the companionship of man, if necessity, and not ascetic pride, requires it. Lofty and beautiful is the character of him in whom this independence on human sympathy is blended with a Christian's love and zeal. Though left without one companion, he can labor, and suffer, rejoice and die, like his Saviour, not alone, for the Father will be with him. How appropriately are we now led to a contemplation of "Christ our fellow sufferer," desiring the bitter cup to be taken away, or grace given to drink it. He "was made perfect through suffering." What a vindication of God's goodness in permitting suffering is such wrought perfection! "The fining pot is for silver, and the furnace for gold; but the Lord trieth the hearts,"— as possessed of affections better than silver and gold. From Christ we learn "how truly and entirely the tenderest susceptibility to pain, and the most intense desire to be saved from it, may consist with the holiest resignation, and the firmest courage and fortitude. We learn that though our nature may be shaken to its foundations, our virtuous principles must not yield a hair; that no prospect of suffering is to

Digitized by Google

move us from the right; that no presence of suffering is to overcome our faith, our duty, our piety. We are not called to disguise the apprehensions and quailings of our nature; for Jesus did not disguise his; but in the same simplicity, the same directness of spirit, we are to dare, in the path of evident duty and God's commandments, we are to dare and endure all to the end."—pp. 190, 191.

"Seeing the Departed"—John xvi. 16,—discourses of "the sudden disappearance of our best blessings to the eye of sense, and their perpetuity and immortality in the sight of faith and religion." And then we have an exquisite composition—"The Crown of Thorns." Christ was crowned only once, and then in mockery; and yet no other crown would have become him so well. Not the festal crown of flowers; nor the crowns of monarchs, conquerors, heroes.

"Take away the toys. Let them not come into this hallowed presence. They would only show how dim and worthless they are, near to that unearthly majesty, and by the side of that crown of thorns. Take away the laurel wreath—it is stained with human blood. There is blood too upon the thorns—but it is the Saviour's own. It is his own blood which he now begins to shed for the liberty and the happiness of his brethren, and not the blood of his brethren, poured out after the manner of conquerors, for his own aggrandizement. It is his own blood, dropping down, not for dominion or fame, but for truth, and peace, and virtue. He fought; but not with carnal weapons, and not to enslave the bodies of men, but to emancipate their minds, and to redeem their souls. He fought; not at the instigation of the lusts of the flesh, and in obedience to them, but undauntedly and perseveringly against them. He conquered; but not to increase the power of death, but to weaken and destroy it, to overthrow the host of darkness, to burst the bonds of sin and the grave. In this warfare he endured hardship, hunger and thirst, pain, reproach and contradiction. Humility, patience, meekness, long-suffering, forgiveness, it was by these that the battle was fought and won. Take the laurel wreath away. It tells not of struggles and victories like these. The bare and rugged thorns are a more expressive and befitting crown for him who loved us and gave himself for us, and by his death destroyed death. Neither bring the gemmed diadems of royalty instead. They have been too much degraded and soiled by the hands which have usurped them, and the heads on which they have descended. They have clasp-

Digitized by Google

ed brains which were on fire with mad ambition, or teeming with dark schemes of tyranny. They have sat idly on heads which were empty of thought, or only thinking of some selfish indulgence; careless of others' wants, and studious only to create or gratify their own. Why should they be brought here? At best they signify but a partial, fluctuating and temporary authority, however well improved and exercised, which human fancy and will may overturn, which a few hours may transfer, and which death will soon cover up in dust. Why then should they be brought here? Here is a king anointed directly from on high, with the unmeasured spirit of God. Here is a ruler who rules over the spirits of men, and will rule for ever; for his voice hath gone forth into all lands, his words unto the ends of the world. Here is a monarch unto whom power has been committed, real, permanent power, over nature, over fear, and over time. And it is through suffering that he holds it; and in endurance and self-denial that he exercises it; not consulting his own will, but that of his Father, nor his own ease, but the welfare of all men, yea, of his enemies. Here he stands, in the hall of a Roman viceroy, who, with all his power, has weakly, and against his own wish and judgment, surrendered a just and innocent one to a furious multitude, and a bloody death. Here he stands, amid insulting cries and ferocious blows, supreme and kingly in suffering love; bound, and yet the only free one there; as a prisoner, condemned to the cross, and yet redeeming countless spirits from captivity and death, through the grace of his righteousness, and the royal might of his overcoming fortitude. Compare his crown of thorns with Pilate's royal cincture — and say which is the truest emblem of dominion, majesty and victory. Is there not in every firm-set, pointed thorn, more self-conquest, more spiritual might, more endurance and more victory, than ever glittered within the compass of a diadem? That twisted bramble is the true crown. Displace it not from the head of the conqueror of death, the redeemer of men, and the king of Israel."—pp. 290 — 212.

"Recognition of Friends," opens some weighty considerations for cherishing the belief that gives tenderness to our hope of immortality — the idea of reunion with those we have loved and who have passed away. "Gone but not lost." The resurrection is that of individuals as individuals; of each person in his own proper personality. From this it is evident that we must know ourselves to be the same individuals who existed here; we must be conscious of our former existence, and those among whom

Digitized by Google

we had our conversation, especially those who were particularly united to us. This establishes the idea of the *recollection* of our friends, and the goodness of God gives us the assurance that we shall be permitted to rejoin those who are essential to our happiness. Intimations are given of this in the exhortations to comfort on the loss of friends, for why do we grieve but for the loss of their society — because they are not visibly with us, and we expect not a return in this life. But here comes the oft-repeated question: "If some with whom the good have been connected here below, should, from their unworthiness, be excluded from the delights and the society of heaven, the good will, on their supposition of knowing this, suffer pain, and pain cannot be suffered in heaven."—(p. 230.) In the answer, it is said, that though heaven is described as a place where there is "no more pain," yet this does not include an entire exemption from imperfection; and as the good must there remember their former state, and its sins, they cannot but regret them, and this regret must beget humility — "a virtue which will not lose its lustre and value amidst the brightest glories of the New Jerusalem;" so, likewise, they may regret the banishment of some with whom they were on earth connected, and yet be so "enlightened with regard to the justice and beneficial ends of that banishment, as not to experience therefrom any suffering which would embitter or be inconsistent with celestial blessedness."—(p. 231.) What are supposed to be "the beneficial ends" of that banishment? Beneficial to whom — the banished, or their complacent friends? We can see no comparison between regret for sins committed, and regret for the banishment of friends from heaven. The one matter reaches to the past; the other to the future. We can easily suppose how the memory of sins committed in this life can minister to a devout gratitude and a heavenly culture, but it is not so easy to conceive of a "beneficent end" for the utter banishment from heaven of those we have loved.

"Heaven would be hell, if loved ones were not there,"

a poet has said, and truly. Asking after the poor prodigal — the seeking of the lost, that they may be saved, is

Digitized by Google

the beauty of human love, as it is the glory of divine. That is true love that loves on to the end.

"They *never* loved who say, I loved *once*."

Again, the preacher tells us, "that vile conduct does alienate brother from brother, and impair affection here on earth." Aye, but was such a brother fit for heaven, and was such affection *Christian?* Vile conduct alienated Esau from his twin-brother Jacob; Absalom from Ammon. But in whom shone attractive virtues; in Esau, whose alienation died away, and who received his brother so graciously that to the surprised Jacob, Esau's face was "as the face of God," — or in Absalom consenting to the murder of Ammon, that Ammon might thus be banished by death? It is said, God does not love all alike, and copying Him, the good in heaven will cease to exercise any strong affection, or any other than sympathy, for those whose vices have here estranged their affections. Whence this idea of God's love? Whence the profanation of the Father's universal and infinite love, that speaks of "aliens from his affectionate regard"? Horror, inexpressible! towards one immortal being the great God will cease to exercise an "affectionate regard" — will take from him his grace, and leave him to utter desolateness of soul! Where is that sweet voice of music that so late was discoursing the melodies of hope, as it dwelt on the guardianship of God over all souls, and assured us that none could stray from under his eye; none can be lost from his care? Where have gone those holy tones that gave a beauty to power, by the amiable ends of its exercise, of which we were told? "Watchman of Israel!" is thine arm shortened that thou canst not save? and shall the poor, bleating, lost sheep in the wilderness, have no "affectionate regard" from the "Good Shepherd"? Shall eternity only echo the appalling cry that went up so vainly, by the couch of dying Isaac, from the pale lips of Esau: "Bless me, even me also, O my Father." Has the thought passed from the memory, that an "exchange of worlds is best even for those who have grossly abused the present life," that "the discipline and awards of another scene should be commenced"?

Digitized by Google

Ah, light springs up! better thoughts are coming — the cloud is turning its silver lining, for it has one. The preacher says: "And yet memory will be faithful, and love will plead. And here I come to a consideration which may obviate the difficulty advanced better than any other, on which better than on any other I like to dwell. Though I fully believe that the wicked will be punished hereafter, and will not undertake to deny that they may not retain their wicked dispositions and thus bring on themselves perpetual punishment, I do not believe that their wickedness or their punishment is necessarily and inevitably eternal. I believe that God's punishments hereafter, as his chastisements here, are designed to be corrective, and that on many, if not on all, they will have a correcting, reforming, and consequently restoring influence. I also believe, according to apostolic teaching, that "charity never faileth," no, not in heaven. And so I believe that it may extend its pitying and saving regards to those who most need them, to those who have made themselves outcasts from the heavenly country, the city of our God."—(p. 234.) And then he goes on, in the right strain, to speak of there being no more blessed errand for the celestials than to labor to bring back the erring and lost ones formerly bound and endeared to them. Who would not forego for a time, and time after time, the society and joys of the blessed abode, to win some prodigal back to God his home? Who would not pray for such a mission, "Let me go to the exile, and persuade him to return. He has suffered long. Long has he been wailing in utter darkness. Remorse must have visited his burning heart. He was not always perverse and wicked. Through the long vista of ages I can see him as he once was. He once was a happy child, an innocent child, affectionate and ingenuous, and pure as the light that beamed from his eyes or played on his clustering hair. I have held him in my arms. I have watched his smiles, and dried his tears. I loved him once. O, that I might cherish him again! that I might bear to him thy forgiveness! that I might bring him back to happiness, to heaven, and to Thee! Would not the Universal Father grant the prayer? Can it be proved to me that the saints and angels are not and will not be occupied in fulfilling his restoring purposes?"—p. 235.

Digitized by Google

Now we are ready to hear "Voices from Heaven," saying unto us, "Come up hither!" to see the brighter proofs of our Father's love and to catch the spirit of unbounded hope." The voices of the stars — of our Saviour Christ — of his glorified saints — of our departed friends — how great and inspiring they are!"—(p. 248.) In the sacred atmosphere of such contemplations, we see "the Good Revealed" — we ask no longer, "Who will show us any good?" we see it "Walking by Faith," and not as though earth were all dark; "as if the footstool caught no rays from the throne." "Lessons of Autumn" is a hopeful strain of music, and, with the Shunamite, we cannot but say, "It is Well!" sweet thoughts to dwell in the heart of the parent who mourns the departure of living sunshine from the now darkened home. "The Offices of Memory," "Peaceful Sleep," and "Christ with us at Evening," continue the soothing and hallowing themes, and beautifully close the "Sermons of Consolation:" a precious volume; a companion for the solitary mourner, to have its holy truths with the heart as the benediction of a mother upon her child. Here gentleness deals with affliction, yet makes a demand for heroic effort; tears are dried from the eyes that they may see duty more clearly, and pursue it. The heart is soothed; then strengthened; then animated; and the comforted can say, with one of our own sweet poets, who now sweeps a lyre in heaven,

> "I will arise
> And go with joy about my household cares,
> And give my soul to peace."

Mr. Peabody's volume is of a different cast. It is stamped with the same sincerity, fervor, and unquestionable sympathy for the afflicted and bereaved, and the same desire to minister to their spiritual necessities. But it is more admonitory in its character; and the tone of his rebukes and warnings, has too little of hopefulness in it. When he speaks of God, he attributes to him every thing morally attractive, and makes his Providence minute, perfect, constant, and efficient; but when he treats of man, he seems, at times, to forget these beautiful and elevating conceptions of the Father, and sees humanity liable to fall into remediless ruin — evil wrought here reaching through

Digitized by Google

the boundless future — the coil that threw him down and fastened him from progress in this life, holding him forever. This is not simply hinted, or intimated. It is spoken boldly, and we have distinctly before us that form of Unitarianism which embraces such high notions of human freedom as forbid the expectation of a final restoration of all souls, otherwise than as a contingency. "The ultimate purpose of all our Father's dispensations" is to fix in the soul the principles of holiness — (61) — all his dispensations have a merciful purpose — (18) — disease and affliction are but uttered forms of mercy — (19) — and hence the exhortation to implicit trust in Providence (54) is rational, and from the mercies of the past he argues against despondency in reference to the future, (54) because of the assurance that under Him all things will work together for our good, (58) as his tender mercies and loving kindness are over the whole human race.—(p. 195.) But, alas! we soon discover that as the Jews of old, when thinking of God as the God of Israel, thus portrayed him, but gave another and repulsive aspect to his character when they treated of the heathen; so we find that the cloud in the desert here, so beautiful, guiding and refreshing, has an Egyptian side — dark and lowering, and from its depths we hear the muttering thunders of impending and overwhelming wrath!

A prominent feature of this volume, is the effort to destroy all confidence in "death-bed repentance." A class of Christians make every thing of such penitence; Mr. Peabody makes it nothing worth. To him a Christian life — the whole past imbued with a practical reverence for the requirements of Christianity, affords the only sure ground of hope in the dying hour, either for others or ourselves. But is there not here an overlooking of the fact, that the extent of God's requirements is according to our ability to do, and if the soul is awakened to a solemn and profound sense of its spiritual relations at the close of life, and can do no more to show its submission to God than through the passive virtues, which are all that the dying can exercise; is not that Christian life? If not, how shall the extent of time that is requisite be ascertained? And if in the last hour penitence be vain, then there is a period in life when repentance is not a duty as it has no value! "Probation" closes then before the expenditure of time,

Digitized by Google

and we are left in the darkness of mystery which gathers in the mind as we think, that perhaps to this and that dear though wandering parent's child, or friend, the time when repentance would avail any thing is past and all effort is vain. "While there's life there's hope!" ceases to be a rational proverb. Hence our author speaks of hope concerning a class of the departed being crushed — (75) — a disembodied spirit filled with horrors and despair — (95) — plunged into depths of despair.—(p 238.) This condition of some departed spirits is intimated in the careful limit — "our good friends" — "those who sleep in Jesus" — "Christian friends" — "Christian believer" — "innocent and pious kindred." Even under the head of "Consoling Views of Death," he speaks of the germ of spiritual life finally dying; (177) and if this be true, it were well if the grave might imprison sometimes the beloved! Immortality to such is only a monument of blight and death eternized. With these fears and tortures, the exhortation is, to live as if on one day were suspended all our interests for eternity!

Such treatment of the great subjects of death and eternity, will "furnish comfort and strength to the afflicted," if the bereaved can be certain of two things, — that the departed bore a true Christian character in life, and that they themselves possess the same. Have we a love for mankind so limited that we can be consoled amid the ravages of death, while we see in prospect millions with no opportunity of improvement, all their capabilities perverted, and we deprived of all hope concerning them? "Bereaved affection" does indeed meet "the risen Saviour at the grave-side," but whether it is comforted or not, depends, it seems, upon whether the departed led a Christian life or not. The mother that goes afar to bend over the grave of the prodigal, finds no comfort in the great thought — he is immortal! Life without hope, without the privilege of improvement, environed with despair, what is it? A mockery of the sublime purpose of God in the creation, and utterly void of comfort to those who contemplate it as the portion of the departed loved ones. One of the most touching, and a truly beautiful passage in the volume before us, is this: "I shall go from the sanctuary to-day to the home of a widow bereft of her only son, faithful,

Digitized by Google

kind, devoted, the staff of her age, her first grief in his behalf, that which rends her heart when she knows that he is dead. With what words shall I comfort the forlorn mother? Shall I babble to her of flowers and butterflies, and talk about the opening Spring; or shall I enter into a metaphysical disquisition on the nature and laws of spirit, and attempt a labored proof of immortality, on grounds which her lacerated mind can neither apprehend nor follow? Or shall I tell her to look within, in proud self-reliance, for her faith and her support, when her stricken and desolate spirit feels more than ever its neediness and its dependence, and craves the voice and the sustaining arm of the Almighty? O, no! I should seem a wanton mocker of her misery. But I can tell her of the widow of Nain, and who stopped the bier; I can talk to her of the new tomb in Joseph's garden, and of the vision of angels on the resurrection morning; and I know that my words will not seem to her as idle tales, but as the power and wisdom of God for her relief and consolation."—(pp. 138, 139.) But reverse the case, and make the sorrow for the dead such as not unfrequently occurs. God pity us! Suppose the only son of the widow to be one of the reckless class; sons of Belial, though children of Eli. He now lies still and cold at her feet by the grave. Once he lay next her heart; its warmth was his life. The sunshine played with his golden hair as he leaped and sported in her arms, and in the dimpling cheek nestled a thousand winning witcheries. One little palm was laid against the other as the hands were lifted in prayer, ere the voice could hardly articulate the words, and holy was the face of sleeping innocence. But years went on, and the world dealt treacherously with the lad. "How has the gold become dim!" and now the wail goes up that he died in sinfulness. David's piteous cry over Absalom is lifted with a more heart-rending pathos, for it is a mother's lamentation. You cannot take away the mother's love for her child. It went with him through all his wanderings on earth. It sent up its prayer when mystery encompassed his life, and the eye knew not where to look for him. And now what comfort is offered? That mockery of love, that profanation of the heart's holiest instincts, that besom of desolation in the holy place, that tells her

Digitized by Google

that she will learn in heaven not to have any "strong affection" for her child. O heaven! thy transformations, if these they be, do but remind us of palaces where plenty riots unmindful of perishing millions. It cannot be. When "the good" die, we cannot doubt they are happy. Immortality is but the synonyme of happiness in respect to them. But David wants comfort for Ammon and Absalom, Jesus for his Judas, and we for those who passed away and made no sign of the cross or its hopes. Here is where the heart faints. Here is where Christian Consolations are essential. To us it is right to say, "Is there here a son who has a mother in heaven? You can even now make her happier. Full as her joy is, it is not perfect while you remain out of the circle of her communion. Your mother's soul still yearns for your salvation. Her intercessions, which first rose over your cradle, now ascend for you near the throne. Enter on the life of heaven, and you hang new jewels on her eternal crown of rejoicing."—(pp. 296–7.) Is there no certainty that that joy will ever be perfected? Shall we say nay! while we declare there is no suffering in heaven?—(pp. 27–8) and that the prayer of the pure and lovely on high is that the divided household may again be made one?—p. 297.

Here is the essential point. When the evil die, must we begin to discipline our affections in order to contract them, lest when we enter heaven we take with us a love that cannot be satisfied — a want never to be answered? Never can we accept that view of heaven which requires the throwing away of that affection which glorifies humanity, and which shone so transcendently in the Redeemer; a view of heaven which assures those who are disturbed lest "a sinner" should be admitted into their company, that they need not entertain any such fears!

These Sermons give the representation of Death so common in Unitarian writings, by which "the great change" is compared to merely a change of raiment.—(p. 142.) Our author should be careful to adopt his own philosophy as expressed in what he says of Analogy,—(p. 133.) The present and the future states of being are widely different from each other, and the passing from the one to the other is by no means comparable to the transition from infancy to childhood, and from thence to manhood, and to

Digitized by Google

age. These take place in the same world, while the spirit is in a mortal, and, more or less, diseased body, and breathes a moral and intellectual atmosphere such as cannot be where the animal wants and propensities no longer exist. We contend for the difference; for the new agencies which must of necessity there arise; and without touching the question of different points of progress at this entrance of souls upon their eternal state, we do contend for the higher and more favorable circumstances for improvement which the change of worlds shall grant to all. We confess ourselves "sacredly bound to embrace our Saviour's doctrine of immortality as a whole, its conditions no less than its promises." So far as the fact of immortality, endless existence beyond the grave, is concerned, all the conditions are with God; and the promises which are designed to comfort and inspire gratitude, cannot be rendered uncertain thus far. The character of immortality, its happiness or misery, becomes the next question; to decide this we are bidden to look back into our lives, rather than forward to the future grace of a Fatherly God! But we cannot accept this process. We find the holiest and best saints pouring out their lamentations over the record of memory. They cannot live on the past; and there is often the deepest sincerity in their depreciating pictures of themselves, because from their high attitude of spirituality, they see more the omissions of duty. We fear our neighbors are not aware how small they make heaven when they assert so positively that it is destined for those only who here "*cheerfully bear the cross*, who lay up treasures above, who do the will of the Father, and *love one another as he has loved us all.*"—p. 74.

We do not mean to be understood as attempting to lessen the value of piety, virtue, holiness. Nor do we believe that heaven and holiness are other than inseparable — a perfect unity. Whatever raises a man above his sins, lifts him into heaven. He enters heaven, as he leaves his sins. The final happiness of all men is predicated on their final holiness. The force of our appeal, in discussing the Consolations of the gospel, is against the limit put to regenerating influences, by which they are confined to this life. We reverently acknowledge that the highest intellectual attainments and pleasures, the most

Digitized by Google

exquisite moral enjoyment, and the most precious of spiritual felicity, are given only through holiness of thought, feeling, and action. Whatever may be the face of things, this is the testimony when we get at the heart. We are not of those against whom the ancient rebuke may be spoken, "Behold, in the day of your fast you find pleasure, and exact all your labor." If heaven is to be ours, we look to it as the free gift of God; and in ascribing to him unutterable praise for redemption, for the bliss of the celestial home, we will have no mental reservation, drawn from the nice metaphysics that make a free gift conditional, and that result which is not of works, to be after all the reward of works. We had rather see man's freedom lost in God's sovereignty, than God's sovereignty lost in man's freedom; but we preserve both by remembering that He "worketh in us, both to will and to do, of his own good pleasure," "that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus."

The prominence given to the Resurrection of Christ as the *only* solid ground of hope of immortality, is an admirable feature in this volume. Too much importance cannot be attached to that sublime event. We would not decry other sources of argument, the intimations of immortality which are given to the thoughtful and reverent soul; but we say that they are not of themselves sufficient. With these only, the scholar, with his mighty intellect, has not known so solid and satisfying a hope, as the humble cottager who knows only how to read his Testament and pray.

Many of the sermons in this volume show the importance of a vivid imagination in the preacher. Pictures of scenes in the life of the Redeemer are given as distinct as by the pencil of the painter, and thus attention is successfully arrested. We receive the volume with thanks, and should not be true to our convictions of duty were we not to allude to its contrast with Mr. Greenwood's. The two present the different phases of Unitarianism as a religion of Consolation. The first has a close and precious affinity with Universalism, being in nothing distinguished from it save by its little reference to the Scriptures, and its want of positiveness in statement, while it argues to a posi-

Digitized by Google

tive result. The other refuses to follow great principles to their legitimate issues, and while laying down premises concerning the nature, character, and government of God, that justify an unlimited hope, tells us of no assurance being given of a moral change beyond this life, for those who die unregenerate. This also has but little to do with the Scriptures so far as citations and references are concerned.

The space already occupied, forbids our saying much in reference to Mr. Chapin's little but precious volume. It will doubtless be in the hands of our readers soon, if not already possessed. It treats grief with considerate tenderness. It is the speech of a deep experience, and its author points others to where he himself looks for consolation. He treats of the Christian view of Sorrow; Christian Consolation in Loneliness; Resignation; the Mission of Little Children; our Revelations to the Departed; the voices of the Dead. Faithfully does he exhibit the new aspect which Christianity has given to sorrow, and how affection may find in gospel hopes all that it can need. He "vindicates God's ways to man" by embracing suffering and grief in the agencies of spiritual discipline, looking to the final result when humanity shall be perfected by its intimate union with the divine.

With the preciousness of that result as a great idea, nothing, with us, shall be brought in competition. It is the crowning light of all consolations. Man immortal, — that is a grand thought! Man immortal and placed in circumstances of progress, — that is a grander thought! But man immortal, progressive, and redeemed from all sin and misery, — *that* is the grandest thought of all!

Here, then, is our philosophy and our religion. We are not to deny trials, or refuse to give them their full weight. They are to be used as means of discipline; and thus employed, they will contribute to the developement of true sublimity of mind and character. We are not to seek relief by hardening our sensibilities, for that were to murder love; but giving to tears their course, we are to struggle for that heroism of soul that shall prevent bereavement from drawing us from duty; and humbly look forward to that life where "Death shall be swallowed up in victory."

H. B——N.

Digitized by Google

Art. V.

The Influence of Christianity on the Roman Civilization.

In entering upon our subject, it may be expedient to begin by a statement of the signification we shall attach to the term "Christianity" throughout this essay. In the first place, then, we do not of course mean sectarian Christianity, or a system composed of a certain number of dogmas, defined by the canons, and stamped with immutability by the seals, of the church. We mean neither Orthodoxy nor Heterodoxy, Unitarianism nor Trinitarianism, but the spirit of the religion of the New Testament, considered apart from every ecclesiastical establishment, in which it has been sometimes wisely clothed, sometimes foolishly and wickedly trammelled.

When we speak of the influence exerted by heathenism upon the world, we do not mean either Grecian or barbarian heathenism exclusively, but polytheism generally. Its various modifications produced peculiarities of habit and thought, more or less mischievous, in the different countries where they respectively flourished; but, when contemplating the effects of the system, we seize upon and trace certain great results in human character, — observable under all the aspects of idolatry — to certain great causes, common to heathenism throughout all its varieties. In noting its influences on human happiness and society, we regard these causes as the characteristics of the system, — the number and semi-human nature of its divinities, for instance; their moral impotence, as contrasted with their physical omnipotence; and the sensuous immortality of its Hades.

Christianity has its characteristics also; sometimes partially obscured, sometimes emerging into broad and efficient prominence, and never wholly lost throughout its eventful march of successive centuries. Adulterated by many of its most upright and conscientious disciples, even from apostolic days, with Platonism, Orientalism Eclecti-

Digitized by Google

cism, &c., yet even in its most corrupt condition, its great distinctive ideas of the universal paternity of God, the universal brotherhood of man, and the purely spiritual immortality to which it destined the race, still retained a moral power to conserve, exalt, and purify. While we trace its action on human progress, we are justified in regarding it as an independent power, composed of certain great principles never utterly extinct or inactive, rather than as a nursling of some ecclesiastical system.

Ere we proceed, we would indicate one other feature peculiar to Christianity, tending powerfully, though perhaps unobservedly, to strengthen its influence over the minds, and consequently the habits, of men. We refer to its truth. That none of the philosophers or men of letters, at the time of the appearance of Christianity, credited the fables on which rested the whole of the ancient mythology, has been frequently and fully demonstrated; and the vulgar, in all likelihood, regarded the religious systems under which they lived, somewhat as the mass of Christian readers for the last century have regarded the story of the Paradise Lost, as a commixture of truth and fiction; the very fiction, however, sanctified by its alliance with truth so sacred, as that it had been an invidious, perhaps an impious, attempt, to separate the real from the fictitious. Christianity, on the contrary, professed to be a religion of facts. On a series of alleged facts, ordinary and extraordinary, attested by credible witnesses, and, unlike the originating circumstances of the opponent systems, involved in no obscurity, but open to the most rigid inspection, she laid bold claim to the credence of mankind on the score of her incontestible truth. We cannot fail to perceive what a vigorous hold on men, this peculiarity, once admitted, must have given her. As Christianity was a system commencing at an era known to all, and attested by occurrences as easily proved as the assassination of Julius Cæsar, or the imperial reign of Augustus, it thus created and maintained a lively and stirring interest in the bosoms of men; an interest which all the varieties of heathenism, floating as they did in confused and gorgeous array of cloudy mythology and poetic fable, were utterly incompetent to produce. Thus manifestly true in the facts upon which it was founded, therefore true in its pretensions to a divine

Digitized by Google

origin and authority, men felt it must also be true in its sublime doctrine and glorious promise. Standing on this ground, Christianity addressed itself to the work of penetrating and permeating the existing structure of human civilization with the great principles of the common paternity of God, the universal brotherhood of men, and the immortality of our race, which were the elements of its own nature. In this way it sought to introduce a purifying and impulsive moral spirit into society, of which it had hitherto been devoid.

It becomes necessary now to glance at the character of the civilization existing in the world at the period of the advent of Christianity. It would be as prejudicial to Christianity, as it would be unfair to human nature, to deny, that, in some respects, *that* civilization was of a very high cast indeed. The first feature of its constitution to which we would allude, is its civic, its urban character. The population of the Roman Empire, in Europe at least, was not composed of agriculturalists and peasantry, styled so commonly the "bone and sinew" of the states of modern Christendom, supporting upon a strong and substantial foundation the other grades of society. The farms throughout the empire were possessed by the Senatorial and Equestrian Orders, or the Patricians, and were cultivated almost entirely by slaves; the *Plebs*, the people, were in the most literal sense, *citizens*, the populace of the cities and towns. The country, at a distance from the towns, was forest, or wilderness, and deemed useful principally as it afforded thoroughfares to connect the towns. The condition of a peasantry does not enter into our survey of Roman civilization. The city of Rome herself, is a fair example of the stage of advancement to which mankind had attained, at the coming of Christ. What aspect then does the civilization of Rome exhibit to us at the era of which we speak? In the first place, what mean we by civilization? Such a stage of advancement in the moral and intellectual progress of a people, as has resulted in the establishment of social, domestic and political institutions, favorable to the highest happiness of the people at large, and conducive to further progress. To ascertain, then, the character of the civilization of Rome, we have but to ascertain the character of these institutions; their condition

Digitized by Google

will reflect that of the civilization amid which Christianity appeared; part of which she destroyed, part of which she conserved, modified, and has transmitted to us. Numerous other causes, no doubt, have contributed to the reconstruction of society, upon a model very different from that which ancient Rome presents us. And had Christianity never descended from heaven, it is probable that we should still have inherited a fabric of social institutions, — we cannot of course believe of equal excellence with those we now enjoy, — but of elements and proportions altogether unlike those of eighteeen hundred years ago. We are sure, however, that the most obstinately sceptical must admit that the religious system of Christ has exerted a prodigiously beneficial influence, in giving its peculiar tone and tendency to the moral, social, and intellectual conditions of modern society.

Rome, when the purple was assumed by Augustus, had arrived at the acme of her political and intellectual grandeur. The vulture of ambition that had carried her triumphant standards around a subjugated world, had retired to plume its weary wings upon the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus; and resting for ever from foreign flight, ere closing its red eye in everlasting slumber, effused its own tyrannous spirit upon the city of its birth. "The Commonwealth of Kings, the Men of Rome," felt the sunshine of freedom fast receding, before the rapidly encroaching shadows of a despot's throne. For this had the republic been reared! This was the slow and unforeseen, but sure, result, to which her insatiable ambition all along had tended; and if, in the accomplishment of this inevitable crisis, her liberties disappeared, she yet glorified it by all that was refined in her manners, gorgeous in her luxury, splendid in her art, and magnificent in her intellect. It was the highest pitch of civilization, to which the spirit of heathenism, in its combined essence of the subtle and beautiful Grecian, and the loftier and more highly toned Roman mythology, ever contributed to exalt a people. Still, imposing as is the picture viewed from a distance, how many of its lineaments, on a closer inspection, start into rigid and repulsive relief!

The population of the city was 2,265,000; and 565,000, or one fourth of this number, was at the utter mercy of the

Digitized by Google

remaining majority, with no human law to shelter, no heavenly hope to cheer them. Over them the other portion of the citizens exercised absolutely, nay legally, the arbitrary power of life and death. This supreme sway of the master over the slave — slave in an infinitely more terrible sense than any the word conveys to modern ears — was not only connived at by the law, but permanently established, and vigilantly guarded. No doubt, for humanity is not utterly depraved, there were many kind and gentle masters; but a gust of passion, or a scarcity of provision for the fish-pond of his owner, was occasion sufficient, at any time, for the slaughter of a slave. A slave could not bear testimony in any case without previously undergoing the torture; and if the master of the family happened to be slain in his own house, his domestics, however numerous, and however innocent, might be put to death. Tacitus, as cited by Horne, relates a case, in which a Præfect being slain by one of his slaves, all, to the number of four hundred, were executed. Such is one feature of the *social* institutions which met, and for a long time resisted, the influence of Christianity.

In the domestic circle, infanticide was regulated by law, and is approved as a matter of state policy, by Plutarch, and even by Seneca. After reaching maturity, the son might be imprisoned, scourged, sold as a chattel, or even put to death, without appeal, at the will of the father. A slave could be sold but once, a son thrice. A daughter, after marriage contracted by the consent of her father, could be torn from the husband she loved, and forced into new, perhaps detested, bonds. The wife was, by law, in the condition of a child to the husband; she might be divorced at pleasure, and even for certain crimes, put to death by him. Licentious and unnatural abominations were not only permitted, but sanctioned by general custom and the example of the most illustrious men in the State. Such is the darker side of the *domestic* institutions of Pagan Rome.

And with respect to the political condition of the people, we make but one remark: Though a large share of individual liberty and happiness may be enjoyed, under an absolute monarchy, as in the case of modern Denmark, yet "the imperial despotism" (we quote from Milman,)

Digitized by Google

" was a tyranny the most oppressive and debasing, without any principles of free and hopeful resistance, or resistance only attainable by the complete dismemberment of the empire, and its severance into a number of hostile states."

Finally, to sum up the description: a ferocity of manners, singularly mingled with refinement; a depravation of general morals, with a fine sentiment, or noble deed, occasionally gleaming athwart the gloom; a dullness, an apparent dormancy indeed, of the social susceptibilities, evinced in a selfish indifference to the miseries of the million, crouching under destitution, disease, age, idiocy, and madness, for whom no shelter was provided, and seemingly no sympathy felt, but who were left, unsolaced and abandoned, each to stagger, as best he might, under his peculiar load of wretchedness, to his solitary grave; a love of savage, and brutal, and bloody excitement, as manifested in the universal and absorbing passion for gladiatorial slaughter; a reckless contempt of the sacredness of human life, as evinced not only in the indiscriminate massacre, descending even to brutes, on the sack of conquered cities, but in the horrid and general practice of poisoning in time of peace; — such are some of the more abhorrent features of that civilization, which Christianity addressed herself to encounter, and not by general action upon the mass, but by the slow, though surer process of the regeneration of the individual, to purge, to exalt, to sanctify; in short, by the principles of her own divine nature, to reconstruct and regulate anew. It was peculiar to Christianity that, instead of promulgating an imperious law, and then resting satisfied with the homage of outward submission, she rather takes up her unnoticed abode in the individual heart, and there, silently but effectively, subdues the little world of restless and rebellious passions, and hallows and enlarges the affections, by imbuing them with her own pure and expansive spirit. But from this mode of her action, we cannot of course expect to witness any very general results upon a condition of society such as that we have depicted, so rooted and universally established as it was, till after the lapse of some considerable time from the period of her advent. Remembering then that the prime object with the religion

Digitized by Google

which Jesus left to the world, was the reformation of individuals, and through them that of society; and that consequently it attempted not to disturb any of the relations of the time, political, social or domestic, but by inspiring men with new and lofty principles of action, it educated and prepared them, gradually and spontaneously to lay aside the corrupt social forms which engirt them, — if we remember this, we may pass over the first century in silence. Nay, it would scarcely be fair to Christianity to expect any palpable developement of her silent agency in the public manners and institutions, until a considerable majority of the population professed themselves her adherents. In that case, we should be justified to proceed at once to the beginning of the fourth century, when her semblance at least, was enthroned in imperial majesty in the palace of the Cæsars. But merely glancing at the generous sympathy and aid, so nobly afforded by the inhabitants of the neighboring cities to Smyrna, desolated by an earthquake about the year A. D. 170, and without hesitation, ascribing conduct so opposite to the selfish spirit of paganism, to the influence, already felt, of the Christian principle of the common brotherhood of the race, let us fix our eye on the eastern portion of the Empire, under the dominion of Maximin, and towards the close of his reign, in the year A. D. 312. A desolating famine pervaded Syria and Egypt. It happened immediately subsequent, if not in the midst of a fiery persecution of the Christians in that portion of the empire. "The scanty and unwholesome food," says Milman,[1] "produced its usual effect, a pestilential malady. Carbuncles broke out all over the body of those seized with it, but particularly attacked the eyes, so that multitudes became helplessly and incurably blind. The houses of the wealthy, secure against the famine, seemed particularly marked out by the pestilence. The hearts of all classes were hardened by the extent of the calamity. The Christians alone took a noble and evangelic revenge upon their suffering enemies. They were active in allaying those miseries of which they were the common victims. They alone displayed the offices of humanity and brotherhood.

[1] Milman's History of Christianity, chap. ix.

Digitized by Google

They were everywhere, tending the living and burying the dead. They distributed bread, visited infected houses, scared away the dogs which preyed in open day on the bodies in the streets, and rendered to them the decencies of burial. The myriads who perished, and were perishing in a state of absolute desertion, acknowledged that Christianity was stronger than love of kindred. The fears and gratitude of mankind were at once awakened in their favor; the fears, which could not but conclude these calamities to be the vengeance of heaven for the persecutions of its favored people; the gratitude, to those who thus repaid good for evil in the midst of a hostile and exasperated society." This was indeed a signal display of the ameliorating influence this new agent of civilization must have exerted upon the sentiments and conduct of mankind; and, largely adulterated in doctrine as it already had become, conclusively proves that its characteristic principles of universal benevolence, still predominated in their influence, over those darker tenets imbibed from the prevailing heathenism, and partially embodied in the creeds of the church. But it is not to be imagined that Christianity reserved its exertions for such extraordinary manifestations. A course of habitual and progressive training, it is evident, must have been requisite thus to transform so numerous a body of men, from the selfish apathy to human distress, which we mentioned as generally characteristic of Paganism, to so compassionate and heroic a moral condition as is revealed in this beautiful episode in the history of human improvement. To form this bright tide of general and overflowing beneficence, how numberless must have been the streams, each gliding on through its own appropriate and secluded channel, and dispensing what an exuberance of moral fertility and holy beauty! Each Christian in that transaction moved at home amid a circle of relatives, connections and acquaintance, and in the every day business of life; and in the familiar sphere of household and social duties must habitually have exercised those gentle charities, and kindly and unobtrusive sympathies, which so sweeten and sanctify existence. It is the peculiar office of Christianity to cultivate, and call into busy and beneficent operation, the elements of which the display, in the incident above recited, was but a pecu-

Digitized by Google

liar and extraordinary demonstration. Nor can we calculate, though we can conceive, the reciprocal effect which this daily imitation of the Master, must have drawn forth in the feelings and conduct of those among whom the Christian mingled. Pagans in creed they may still have remained, but christianized partially, at least, in sentiment and life, we feel they must have been, or human nature, bad as it is, was not then what we behold it now.

And thus would this new and spiritual element more and more expansively mingle with the mutual good offices, and the duties of mankind. Some twelve years after the event just related, we find Licinius, the antagonist of Constantine, prohibiting the Christians access to the prisons in his dominions. From whatever motive it sprung, this edict reveals a practice alike honorable to the prohibited, and indicative of a new feature in the social intercourse of men; an active and compassionate sympathy on the part of a numerous body towards the unfortunate and the outcast, nay, the vile, the guilty, the abandoned. When was it known, that under the influences of heathenism, such an interest and affection for the miserable and degraded burned in the bosoms of the respectable and the virtuous, as to urge to the ministry of the dungeon? What Howard of paganism rests his fame on love for the felon? Not one. But here was a host of nameless Howards. What constituted them such? Christianity.

It was the universal and invariable practice of the Romans on the capture of a city, to indulge in promiscuous massacre until a given signal from the general;[2] the same, if we rightly remember, was the custom on the field of battle till victory was secure. Ere the last conflict which put Constantine into undisputed possession of the purple, we read that orders were issued to spare the lives of the enemy, and rewards offered for all captives brought in alive. Although this account rests on the somewhat equivocal testimony of Eusebius, the very relation of it as a laudable act shows, as the before quoted historian discriminatingly observes, "the new spirit which was working in the mind of man." In the manifest alteration for the better, in the purer and gentler manners of the time of

[2] Milman, chap. i., citation from Polybius.

Digitized by Google

Constantine, and even in the more stringent laws against vice, — (though it must be confessed, these still partake of the unrelenting spirit of the by no means effete heathenism of the period,) — in all these, we perceive clear indications of the influence of Christianity working forth upon the unconsecrated mass, from the individual bosoms purified by its power, and beating loyally under its immediate sway. It is useless to oppose the admitted criminality and pusillanimity of many of the Christian emperors. Besides that the religion of Christ does not profess to accomplish every thing at once, and that the despotism, which marked the institutions of the Empire, was an atmosphere exceedingly uncongenial to the free and vigorous action necessary to her success, yet surely none of these men will suffer from a comparison with the Neros, Domitians, and Caligulas of the pagan period, who almost constrain our reluctant assent to the possibility of the total corruption of our common nature.

We have said that Christianity attempted not to interfere with the relations of social life which it found established at its entrance. About this period, however, and thence downward to the demolition of the Empire by the barbarians, we find traces of the Christian spirit mingling in the laws and enactments for the mutual duties of master and slave, husband and wife, and the obedience of the subject; though the absolutism of the imperial prerogative in things secular is not meddled with. We see it also in the fearless, though sometimes unjustifiable, bearing of Athanasius towards four emperors, Constantine, Constantius, Julian, and Valens, openly asserting that claim to independence in things spiritual, which was afterwards by the ungovernable ambition of the prelates, pushed into a demand for temporal supremacy.

First, with respect to slavery; if Christianity did not abolish it, she greatly mitigated its horrors. The practice of selling children into slavery, which, during a period of famine and misery previous to the accession of Constantine, had become fearfully common, was prohibited by that prince under the advice, it is said, of a Christian tutor, and a voluntary obedience induced by the assignment of funds for the support of such children as the parents were unable to maintain. The separation of relatives among slaves

Digitized by Google

was discountenanced, and the master was deprived of the power of life and death. Above all, though custom and long-established habit still retained the earthly distinction between freeman and bondman, the great principle to which is to be ascribed all the growing humanity of the servile laws, that God is equally the Father of serf and Cæsar, was loudly and universally proclaimed, regulating the sway of Christian masters, and, in a more remote degree, that of their heathen neighbors.

The statutes of the same period relative to marriage, though deficient in Christian tone, gave, nevertheless, a higher moral sanctity to the institution. But it was less by statute than by the silent internal working of its pure principles in the heart, that Christianity achieved its greatest triumph in reference to the conjugal union. Love as a passion, somewhat refined no doubt by the influence of intellect, is lavishly extolled throughout ancient pagan poetry; but love, the moral sentiment, hallowing the passion, and shining on in the serene depths of the soul long after the turbulence of the passion has subsided with the boiling flood that produced it — this spiritual affection, which lights the young years of life with such a golden sunshine of joy, and suffuses the encroaching horizon of age with a gloaming of silent gladness, is utterly unknown to heathenism. The religion alone of the God of love bequeathed it to the connection of Christian marriage, by inspiring the heart with an unrecognized, perhaps, but yet a felt, consciousness of the immortality, not of the relationship itself, but of the affection which craved and created it.

Lastly, with respect to political liberty. As Christianity spread throughout the Empire, it inspired an ardent desire for moral independence. We cited the case of Athanasius — we migh instance also the fearless independence of Basil and Ambrose — as an example of triumphant assertion of spiritual liberty, in the face of the Imperial power. True, that great man denied to his fellow Arian Christians the same freedom; still, while the extravagance of the feeling is easily traced to the human passion which mingles with our purest sentiments, the principle itself is as clearly attributable to the action of that Christianity, which cannot breathe in a condition of moral bondage. Unfettered rational inquiry is necessary to the birth of the Chris-

Digitized by Google

tian religion in the soul; unrestrained intellectual and moral exercise, to its developement there. Accordingly we find the Christians of the period of which we speak, whatever their political position, the only moral freemen of the Roman world.

But this settled resistance to mental tyranny, a resistance which is inherent in Christianity, and which, smothered for a long course of ages, at last upheaved the load that weighed it down, and burst forth in the great Reformation, will gradually but surely awaken its subjects to feel the necessity of some guarantee for the security and perpetuity of the moral liberty it craves. Such security can only be attained under political institutions more or less free. Therefore — while we admit the agency of other causes — we claim for the principles of Christianity an important share, at least, in contributing to that peculiar freedom, which, in its adaptation to the independence of the individual, is so strikingly dissimilar to the mere political freedom of the old world, and which may thus be regarded as characteristic of modern civilization. This claim for Christianity, as a very efficient agent in the formation of that peculiar structure of civilization, which, under all the varieties of political institutions in existing Christian states, secures to the individual a consciousness of personal worth and independence, thus necessarily modifying the practice of theoretically despotic governments, will be sustained and confirmed, if, overleaping the limits assigned by the title of our subject, we study its action upon the reconstruction of society consequent on the downfall of the Western Empire, and consider the real share and tendency of its influence upon the feudal system, chivalry, and the crusades, its perpetual, latent resistance to its own illegitimate offspring, the Papacy, its agency in the Reformation, and its effects on individual and national intellect and progress, from that event to the present period. Instead of expatiating on this point, however, we would only observe, that throughout the darkness of a decade of centuries, into which Christianity was plunged on the dissolution of the Empire, we can still discern most of the great events of that period to have been but distorted developements of her hidden agency. What, for instance, was the spiritual, even the temporal, absolutism of the

Digitized by Google

Popedom, but an extravagant carricature of her inherent spirit of resistance to the State-power that had so long overshadowed her, and the ineradicable conviction of the heart, that hers should be the presiding influence over all human action? What, again, were the crusades, and chivalry, but serious burlesques, played by barbarian passion, upon her immanent principles of brotherly love, and impatience of oppression? And since the Reformation,—itself a triumphant assertion of mental freedom — her influence on the progress of civilization, in elevating morals, refining literature, ameliorating law, softening the horrors of war, and so contributing to the furtherance of individual comfort and independence, thereby preparing the mind for the exercise, and then urging the desire for the entertainment, of rational political liberty, — has been too palpable and energetic, to be denied by the hardiest scepticism.

Such were some of the results, wrought on that share of our civilization inherited from the Romans, by the purifying energy of Christianity. Can we close our theme without an inquiring glance upon the future? Under the first era, the religion of Christ largely impregnated civilization with its own gentle spirit, thus softening and refining it; under the second, conserving so much of it as went not down with the Roman wreck, it reconstructed society with what rude materials it had, and, constant in its struggles to urge the mind to heave off the barbaric incubus, at length succeeded; under the third period, with fresh vigor has it labored to mould the morals of mankind after a higher type, by successive, more spiritual, and expansive revealings of the benignant spirit of God, and of the beneficent and practical nature of the duty we owe him. And the dawn of its fourth day *hath* already dappled the horizon. Though ages may elapse, ere that sun which shall no more go down, attain its zenith, we can at least catch the promise of its meridian splendor, in that universal benevolence, which already bathes the world in a flush of light and loveliness before unknown. The consummation chanted by ancient bard, and foretold by ancient seer, when the fierce and intractable spirit still so general, shall be subdued, "and shall quiet itself like a weaned child;" when "the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall lay his hand

Digitized by Google

upon the cockatrice's den; when the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard lie down with the kid, the calf, the young lion, and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them."

Whence spring the novel efforts of modern governments to educate, to elevate, and, by legislative enactment, to protect and regenerate the masses? Whence that profound sympathy for the unfortunate, the wretched, aye, the guilty, so rapidly permeating the public mind, and even at times extravagantly overreaching its own aims by a false leniency towards crime? Whence the desire and the efforts to lift woman to her true position — woman, the crouching slave of the old time, the plaything, the doll of chivalry, the serviceable housewife of a more recent day, now beginning at least to be regarded as the moral and intellectual Christian mother of future generations? Whence those tumultuous heavings of the community, in the movements of reform — which, whether judicious or injudicious in method, are shaking loose, and dispersing, the corrupt scum, hitherto weltering on the surface of society? What benign and beautiful spirit is she, who now circling the civilized world, and pointing its myriads to a common Fatherhood and home, reminds them, that as not the vilest of our guilty brotherhood are beyond the limits of the great Parent's reclaiming and purifying grace, so it is our part as imitators of God hopefully to struggle on, until we win, within the pale of virtue and piety, those children of perdition, who now wander desolate and abandoned in outer darkness? What, but the spirit of him of Nazareth, the genius of Christianity! This is the guardian angel, who, holding in her hand the ultimate destinies of all human progress, shall yet sanctify science, and transform art, and glorify literature, more fully than she has ever yet done, and, by a million golden cords, shall yet draw all hearts in happiness, before the throne of God and him that sitteth thereon; and, filling the earth with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea, cause all flesh to see and rejoice in the salvation of God.

A. G. L.

Digitized by Google

Art. VI.

Dogmatic and Religious History of Universalism in America.

Universalism existed among some of the theologians, and even in some of the religious communities, of this country, many years before the rise of Universalists as a distinct body. It still continues to exist, here, out of our connection, to a greater extent, perhaps, than is commonly supposed. But since it would be very difficult for us to ascertain how far it has prevailed, secretly as well as openly, in the Christian community at large, we prefer, for the present, to pass over all the traces, incomplete at best, which we know of it in other sects, and to confine our view to its manifestations among avowed Universalists. By so doing, we shall be spared the distraction of following our subject out into several unconnected bodies, in each of which it has had a developement in some degree separate and peculiar; we shall also avoid the indelicacy of pronouncing, for others, what their sentiments are, and of seeming to claim a fellowship with them, in opinion, when such a claim might be offensive or unwelcome to them.

The doctrinal and religious history of our denomination in this country, is not generally understood. In certain respects, it is greatly misconceived, even by some who are disposed to do us justice, and probably by not a few of our own members, especially by those who have come forward since the first generation and most of the second, had passed away. It appears desirable, therefore, that the facts should be recalled, and the matter set in its true light, while the means are at hand. We could wish that the work were undertaken by another, — by one who has already rendered an inestimable service to the Modern History of Universalism, and who is prepared to contribute still further towards its completion, from abundant materials that he has been gathering, with his characteristic

Digitized by Google

diligence, for nearly twenty years. Notwithstanding the free access which he has allowed us to his collections, our own acquaintance with the particular facts in the case, is much inferior still to his. It will not be surprising, therefore, if we omit many things, through ignorance, and even fall into some circumstantial errors, which his ready knowlege will at once detect. We trust, however, that the general view which we shall give, will be found sufficiently accurate, and that it will serve a good purpose, until it shall be superseded by a more complete account.

Our denomination, since its rise in this country, has gone through two noticeable changes of doctrine, and consequently of religious character; for the latter naturally follows the former. There are indications, also, that it has now entered on the third. Its history, therefore, is naturally distinguished into periods corresponding in time. Neither of these changes can, of course, be assigned to a precise date, as they took place but gradually, like all transitions of the kind, — new influences first mingling with the old, and, even when these had gained the ascendency, the elements of the former state of things still reaching forward into the succeeding. The first of them occurred about the commencement of the present century, when the former doctrines of the trinity, of the vicarious or penal character of Christ's death, and of Antinomianism, began to give way to Unitarian viewson these points. The second took place between the years 1817 and 1824, when the tendency, which had long been increasing, to confine all sin and its consequences to the present life, assumed a more determinate character, and become predominant. The third charge, if it prove to be general, may be said to have begun within a few of the last years, when the current of opinion has run more strongly in favor of a moral connection of the present life with the future, and when the sharp outlines of doctrines in general have been softened down, if not sometimes obliterated, — to say nothing of certain movements occasioned by the rationalistic and transcendental tendencies without.

From A. D. 1770, to A. D. 1805.

It is well known that the Universalism which arose here, as a distinct system of faith, came from Eng-

Digitized by Google

land.[1] The same year, (1770,) in which Mr. Murray, the father of our denomination in America, landed on the coast of New Jersey, the works of his teacher, Mr. Relly, were brought over, by an Englishman, to Gloucester, Mass. Here they were read and warmly admired by a few persons, who received their doctrine with great earnestness,[2] and who awaited but the impulse of coming events to bring them forward as a distinct body of Christians. As this was the first germ that took permanent root, and that was gradually expanded into the results of our own day, a brief notice of its elements may be given here, though we shall meet with further illustrations under the ministry of Mr. Murray.

In respect to its peculiar form, the Universalism, thus introduced, was an offshoot from the high Calvinism of the Whitefield school, to which Mr. Relly, as well as his disciple Mr. Murray, once belonged, and in which the religious sentiments of both had been fashioned.[3] As all mankind, according to the old creed, sinned in Adam, and incurred eternal damnation by his fall, and as Christ bore this infinite punishment and guilt in behalf of those who shall be saved, Relly thought it requisite to find some ground of justice in such an economy. How was such a transfer of sin and its penalty consistent with the terms of God's law, which explicitly declared that "the soul which sinneth, *it* shall die," and that the innocent should not suffer for the guilty? or how was it reconcileable with equity? It could not be accounted for on the ground merely of the divine Sovereignty, that is, without regard to inherent justice in the case; because, if God's Absoluteness could set justice aside, it might, of course, have gone straight to its aim by remitting the whole penalty at once, instead of transferring it. Nor would it do to say that the sufferings of Christ were only *accepted* as a satisfaction for man's offence, only *reckoned* as such, by God's sovereign pleasure; because, according to this, they were not in

[1] In this sketch, the Modern History of Universalism will, of course, be our text-book, with which we shall suppose our readers familiar, and to which we now refer them, once for all.

[2] Life of Murray, (Whittemore's Ed., 1833,) p. 174.

[3] Do. p. 56, and seq.

Digitized by Google

themselves an adequate satisfaction; and, moreover, any sufferings whatsoever, even those of a mere man, might as well have been thus arbitrarily accepted; so that there would have been no need of selecting, as the victim, an infinite person of the Godhead. There must be a perfect consistency with eternal justice, in the arrangement. This consistency Relly found, in such a thorough "Union" of Christ with the human race, as made their acts his, and his theirs. As all mankind were somehow present in the first Adam, and really sinned in him, not by a fictitious imputation but by actual participation; so, all men were really contained in Christ, "the second Adam," "the Head of every man;" and he was, therefore, as justly accountable for their doings, as the head, in a natural body, is accountable for the deeds of the inferior members. In his corporate capacity, as containing them, he was truly guilty of their offence. Accordingly, he was justly punished for it; and they again, being his members, really suffered in him the infinite penalty he endured, and thus paid up their own debt. The law, now, has no demands on them, or, which is the same thing, on him; and there is no occasion for preaching its terrors at all, nor even for enjoining its commands, except to make us feel our inability to obey them, and thus compel us to rely exclusively on the obedience of Christ our Head. The law, which condemns, is superseded by the gospel, which declares the complete and finished justification of the whole world. We must, however, believe this fact, in order to be freed from the sense of guilt and from fear. All are perfectly righteous in Christ, through whom alone God regards them; though, in themselves, all are totally depraved, and helpless in their sin. Such was the "Union" which Relly held.[4] He proved it by the literal, and often laughable, construction of numerous texts, and illustrated it by the supposed allegories of the Mosaic rituals. If the scheme be but a series of mere verbal fictions, we should still remember that it is no more so than was the old popular system from which it came, and that it even had superior merit, not only as more complete, but as an attempt to maintain the sacredness of moral equity in the divine ad-

[4] Union, &c., by James Relly. I have not read his other works.

Digitized by Google

ministration. In Relly's work, it is often argued with no small degree of acuteness.

This was the scheme, in general, to which Murray devoted his ministry. We need not show that it must have had great charms for such minds as were thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the recent New-light doctrines, and of Whitefield's preaching. Accordingly, wherever Murray went, the devouter part of his admirers appears to have been of this class, including the Separatists, the high Calvinistic Baptists, &c.; though a few of his warm friends were among those who had stood aloof from the late excitements, and who had formed perhaps no very definite system of religious faith.

The first four years after his arrival, from the autumn of 1770 to that of 1774, he made many excursions, and preached, chiefly on the sea-board, from Maryland to New Hampshire, without staying long in any place, except at his home on the eastern shore of New Jersey. In some respects, he was well fitted to follow, as a gleaner, over the ground that Whitefield had harvested. He had the same popular kind of eloquence, though much inferior in its range. The social circle, and especially the pulpit, were his home, where his mind had freest play, and communicated itself as it were by magnetic influence to his associates or hearers. A short and rather stout man, but very active, with broad and strongly marked features, a little upturned, of a resolute cast, sometimes shaded with melancholy, but usually alive with sprightliness and humor, his ready utterance and remarkably familiar address, full of unexpected turns, carried his audience with him through all his rapid combinations of ideas, or moods of feeling. In Philadelphia, New York, Norwich, New London, Newport, Providence, Boston, Newburyport, Porstmouth, and many smaller towns, he produced much sensation, at this early period, and gained numerous admirers among the clergy as well as the laity; while he also met with strenuous opposition, in most places, from those who suspected his Orthodoxy, or who deemed him an interloper in the ministry.

It appears that he had, as yet, seldom if ever declared his Universalism distinctly in public. His usual method, at that time, was to confine his discourses to our "union."

Digitized by Google

with Christ, to our freedom from the claims of "the law," to the "finished" salvation that we have in Christ, — in short, to those points in his doctrine, with which high Calvinists would the most readily sympathize; leaving his hearers to overlook, or to anticipate, the results to which he was carrying them.[5] We cannot exculpate him from disingenuousness in this procedure. He suffered the natural consequence, though he does not seem to have appreciated the cause. People were stung into indignation, when they discovered that they had been duped. Most of his admirers among the ministers turned violently against him; the churches sounded the alarm; and nothing was too bad to be suspected of a man who had thus practised concealment. In all places, however, that he had visited, many even of the religious community still adhered to him; among whom were a few ministers, who either did not yet clearly understand his faith, or else were more or less inclined towards it. He himself does not appear to have been conscious of any moral obliquity in the course he pursued;[6] and the countenance which some distinguished personages gave him, may be regarded as evidence that the disinterested, or indifferent, did not think him guilty of criminal imposition. We must also observe that he gave some occasion to another charge brought against

[5] Life of Murray, p. 168. For the invariableness with which he pursued this course, at first, examine his accounts of his first preaching in the several places, down to the latter part of the year 1774, — at New York, pp. 124, 128; in New Jersey, pp. 128, 129; at Philadelphia, pp. 130, 131; in Dr. Stiles's church at Newport, pp. 147, 150, compared with the inquiries, submitted to him, the next year, at Newport and Providence, pp. 159, 160, and his answers. The church of Separatists at Portsmouth, N. H., invited him, in the beginning of 1774, to become their pastor (p. 171) evidently taking him for some kind of a Calvinist. At his first visit to Newburyport, he seems to have been regarded, if we may judge by his patrons, as a successor to Whitefield, pp. 166, 167, certainly not as a believer in Universalism, see pp. 181, 182. At Boston, his views were not known till his second visit in the autumn of 1774, p. 175. Dr. Stiles's testimony concerning his positive denial may, we hope, be abated, on the ground of some misapprehension: see "Answer to the Appeal," &c., p. 10., among Rev. T. Whittemore's Collection of Universalist Tracts, vol. xv. Mr. Murray observed the same concealment, in preaching, on his visit to England in 1788, (Life, pp. 202, 203; Letters, &c. ii. 263.)

[6] Life, p. 168, where he frankly states his method, apparently with self-approval.

Digitized by Google

him, viz., that he claimed for himself a special commission from heaven to preach. It is doubtful, however, whether his language, of this purport, was any thing more than a vague phraseology which he used without defining its significance in his own mind. Rhetoric, rather than logic, was his element. He was a rapid thinker, and dexterous manager, but not very systematic; adroit, never profound; confident, positive even in minutiæ; full of ardor, which rose with opposition; somewhat romantic, egotistical, apt to see special references to himself in almost every turn of Providence; overflowing with social spirits, humorous, always ready, versatile in his temper, but at the same time quite self-possessed.

While at Boston, in the autumn of 1774, he was accused, perhaps, by the Rev. Mr. Croswell, in the public papers, of being a preacher of Relly's doctrine;[7] and some of the Rellyans at Gloucester, seeing the charge, despatched a messenger, requesting him to visit them. Thither he went, on the 3d of November; and was surprised to find, for the first time since crossing the Atlantic, a small circle of friends who were already indoctrinated in his adopted system. He repeated his visit, in a few weeks. For some time, however, his views do not seem to have been generally suspected, in that place; as he was invited into the pulpit by the deacons of the parish, and, though some dissatisfaction arose, he continued to preach in it, till the following January. But when he fully disclosed his Universalism, and began to speak against the settled ministers, the revolt came, as it had come in other places, and the doors of the church were indignantly shut against him, by the majority.[8] Then followed a long and desperate quarrel, the blame of which it would now be difficult to apportion, with exactness, between the two parties, though the effects naturally fell with the most severity on the weaker, or the minority.[9]

[7] Life, p. 174, compare p. 175, where Mr. Croswell is said to have made this charge, a few Sundays afterwards, at one of Murray's lectures.

[8] Life, pp. 174, 181. See also "An Answer to the Appeal," &c. mentioned in a former note.

[9] Life, pp. 182 and seq. gives one side of the story; the "Answer to the Appeal," which is in some respects an important document, gives the other side.

Digitized by Google

This was the beginning of Mr. Murray's residence in Gloucester; where he continued to preach, at first, in private dwellings, after his exclusion from the parish church. He made frequent journeys, however; and the summer of 1775 he spent in the neighborhood of Boston, as chaplain of the Rhode Island brigade, under the appointment of its officers, and particularly of his friends, Generals Varnum and Greene. The other chaplains in the army petitioned for his removal; but Gen. Washington confirmed him in his office.[10] From this time onwards, he was generally known, we suppose, as a preacher of Universalism, on Relly's plan. At this date, therefore, (the beginning of 1775,) we may fix the commencement of its avowed and distinct ministry, in this country; though, as we have already observed, that doctrine had long been held here, in other forms, by clergymen as well as by laymen of the older denominations. But these, for the most part, stood aloof from him.

As late as 1777, there probably was not a preacher, in America, associated with Murray. He had free access, however, to several pulpits, — among others, to the Episcopal in Porsmouth, N. H., to the Congregational and perhaps the Episcopal in Norwich, Conn., perhaps to one in New York and to the Episcopal in Philadelphia. Some clergymen still countenanced him; and, besides the converts that had been gained after his open avowal, many of his former admirers, in the cities and towns along the Atlantic border, had become Universalists.

It would be difficult to give an idea of his public discourses, they were so *extempore* in their character, and so full of unexpected far-fetched combinations. No man ever exceeded him in rapidly weaving together a web of texts, connected only by the slightest verbal relations; no man ever felt more confident, than he, of the validity of such workmanship. Often he but allegorized a scriptural incident or circumstance, that supplied him with a few slender threads, which grew, under his dexterous manufacture, into the complete garment of universal salvation. The text, "Thou shalt make holy garments for Aaron, thy brother, for glory and beauty," denoted that Christ is our

[10] Life, pp. 183 — 185. Answer to the Appeal, p. 6.

Digitized by Google

high priest, typified by Aaron; that his *garments* are all mankind, for he clothed himself with our nature; that we are all *holy* in him, for he is made unto us wisdom, sanctification and redemption; and finally that his garments, or all mankind, shall be *glorious* and *beautiful*.[11] Sometimes he illustrated his text by standard points in the Calvinistic divinity. "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world," shows that the sin which Christ put away by his death, was that of the whole world, not of a part only; and that all were thenceforth free from punishment. Sometimes, again, he reasons on general principles, from the character of God, and the force of moral considerations. This, however, is but seldom; his arguments being usually a species of mere dialectics. In the disputations that were forced upon him, wherever he went, he never failed either to convince his opponents by surprising turns, which seemed to flash out new light on the subject, or else to perplex them by his adroitness and eccentric range of thought. Not that he resorted to these methods by artifice; his own mind naturally moved in the track which he followed, and the enthusiastic assurance that he felt, in the truth of his arguments and illustrations, gave them force with his hearers.

We think he did not usually urge the Antinomian bearings of his doctrine quite so offensively as did Relly, though the views of both were the same in effect. As individuals, all are equally condemned by God's law; as members of Christ, all are equally justified. Since we bore the full penalty of divine justice in Christ's death, there can be no more punishment for sin; the sufferings, that still follow transgression, being only its necessary consequence, not its punishment. This was considered an important distinction. Faith in our "union" with Christ is requisite to free us from the fear of wrath and from the feeling of guilt; and this faith is attended with love to God and man, as its natural fruits, but not as obedience, properly speaking. Of this latter, we can have none, save that which is performed for us, by our "Head." A few are elected to obtain a knowledge of the truth, in this life; and these go into Paradise immediately at death. But

[11] Letters and sketches of Sermons, by John Murray, &c. vol. iii. p. 11.

Digitized by Google

the rest, who die in unbelief, depart into darkness, where they will remain under terrible apprehensions of God's wrath, until they are enlightened. Their sufferings are neither penal nor disciplinary, but simply the effect of unbelief. Some will believe, and be delivered from their darkness, in the intermediate state. At the General Judgement, such as have not previously been brought into the truth, will "come forth to the resurrection of damnation," and, through ignorance of God's purpose, they will "call on the rocks and mountains to fall on them and hide them from the face of Him who sitteth on the throne;" while the elect shall not be judged at all, having already judged themselves, but shall sit on the tribunal conjointly with Christ. When "the books shall be opened," however, in which all actions are recorded, "every mouth shall be stopped, and the whole world become guilty before God." Then the Judge will make the final separation, dividing "the sheep," or universal human nature, from "the goats," which are the fallen angels, and send the latter away "into everlasting fire." At the same time he will open another book, "the book of life," in which all his members are recorded, and having made himself known, like Joseph of old, to his ignorant, terrified brethren, he will receive all mankind into "the kingdom prepared for them before the foundation of the world."[12] For the devils there is no explicit promise of release; but Murray evidently had a secret hope in their favor,[13] on the ground, we suppose, of what used to be called "the uncovenanted mercies of God."

His manner of interpreting Scripture was very extraordinary, even when compared with the exegisis adopted in the old Presbyterian Confession of Faith. It can be matched, however, by specimens from some of the earliest fathers, and by the usages of some recent Theosophists. Like Relly, he sees Christ embodying all men in himself, everywhere in the Bible. In this verse of the 49th Psalm,

[12] I have gathered this summary of his doctrine from his Letters and Sketches. See, also, Life, pp. 233—237, where Mrs. Murray gives a summary. For the process of the General Judgement, see Letters and Sketches, vol. i. pp. 95, 114, 279—283: ii. 222, 223, 247, 248: iii. 351—353. See Life, Appendix D.

[13] Letters and Sketches, i. 386, 387: ii. 348: iii. 358.

Digitized by Google

"Wherefore should I fear in the days of evil, when the iniquity of *my heels* shall compass me about?" it is Christ who speaks, meaning by his *heels* all mankind, who were his lower members; accordingly, it was his *heel*, the heel of the woman's Seed, which the Serpent was to bruise,—that is, mankind.[14] Isaiah says, (xxiv.) "Behold the Lord maketh the earth *empty;*" this was when he was "lifted up from the earth, and drew all men unto him," leaving the earth empty of them.[15] Noah sent forth a raven from the ark, (Gen. viii.); the ark was Christ, containing us, and the raven was our uncleanness which he put away,—the raven being an unclean bird.[16] These are but specimens of his interpretations. He also seems to have adopted Relly's rule, to apply to Christ every text in which anything good is attributed to men. Thus, all the beatitudes, in the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount, are spoken only of Christ,—"Blessed are the poor in spirit, ... they that mourn, ... the meek," &c.,—for none but Christ answered this description. He, too, was the "blessed man," mentioned in the first Psalm, who had "not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, nor stood in the way of sinners," &c.[17] In the use of this rule, however, he was by no means consistent. They who had "done good, and should come forth to the resurrection of life," were the believers, who might be said, in a qualified sense, to have done good.[18] Sometimes, also, Christ is spoken of as wicked; since he was made sin for us, in his "corporate capacity," as the "Head of every man." Thus, when Jeremiah says, (xxx.), "Behold the whirlwind of the Lord goeth forth with fury; a continuing whirlwind, it shall fall with pain upon the *head* of the *wicked*," it is doubtful whether Christ, the "Head" of our wicked race, is meant, or that "wicked" one, spoken of in 2 Thess. ii.[19] As the requisitions of the law can be fulfilled by no man in his own person, many of the Scripture injunctions are accounted for on what may be called the rule of defiance. Thus, the

[14] Letters, &c. i. 45, 88, 90. This is also Relly's exposition.

[15] Letters, &c. i. 89. [16] Letters, &c. i. 48.

[17] Letters, &c. i. 229, 368. But see also iii. pp. 193–198, a later sketch, where this exposition is somewhat modified.

[18] Letters, &c. i. 278—283. [19] Letters, &c. i. 38.

Digitized by Google

exhortations, "Strive to enter in at the straight gate," "work out your own salvation," &c., were given only as challenges, that our impotence to perform the impossibilities might be the more sensibly felt.[20] Some passages of this kind, however, he interprets in the natural way, notwithstanding the contrary demands of his system. But we must pass on, to a miscellaneous class of examples. The "son of perdition," whom alone our Saviour had "lost," (John xvii.) was not Judas, but "the man of sin," (2 Thess. ii.) or the devil, who "sitteth in the temple of God," (that is, in "our bodies, which are the temple of God;") and Christ "lost" him, when he put away sin by his own death.[21] Isaiah says, (lxvi.) "All flesh shall come to worship before me, saith the Lord. And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Now, these "carcasses" are the body of sin and death which cleaves to every man, but which shall be separated from our nature, in the last day, and be "looked upon" with abhorrence, by all.[22] The "chaff," and the "tares," or "children of the devil," which are to be separated from the "wheat," or "good seed," and then burned, are the sins of mankind.[23] When Christ says, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," &c., he means, by Cæsar, the devil; and the doctrine of the text is, that all our sins are to be rendered back to the devil, but our souls unto God, — for they are God's.[24] The "abomination of desolation standing in the holy place," is all kinds of sin standing, or dwelling, in human nature, which has been made a "holy place," by Christ,— all sin that is mingled with God's purchased possession.[25] The "sin unto death" (1 John v.) is sin in general; for "the wages of sin is *death*."[26] The "second death" is that which we suffered in Christ's crucifixion; the first having taken place in Adam's fall.[27] The man in the par-

[20] Letters, &c. i. 107, 148, 149.
[21] Letters, &c. i. 124—127.
[22] Letters, &c. i. 49, 69, 75, 112, 113.
[23] Letters, &c. ii. 34–36: i. 315.
[24] Letters, &c. i. 51, 115.
[25] Letters, &c. i. 56, 57.
[26] Letters, &c. i. 44,
[27] Letters, &c. i. 62.

Digitized by Google

able, who had not on "a wedding-garment," was the devil, who shall be cast out "speechless," in the day of judgement, &c. &c.[28]

From the foregoing sketch, it will be seen that his Universalism was based exclusively on the fact of the "Union" of all men with Christ in such a sense that his punishment and obedience were theirs. It was but this one idea unfolded out to its complete extent. He does not, indeed, wholly overlook other considerations; but, whether drawn from the character of God, from moral principles, or from the direct disclosures which the Scriptures give of the final state of things in the divine economy, they were all of quite secondary importance with him. Indeed, with his views of justice and of God's law, even the arguments which he did sometimes infer from the divine perfections, were questionable, though he does not seem to have been aware of the logical inconsistency. There was a latent consciousness, however, that held him back from resting the final result on this ground. But the "Union" was sufficient of itself; it made the result a fact already "finished" in reality, needing no further confirmation. Accordingly, the texts that he relied upon, and most frequently used, were such as were supposed to refer to that one point; not those which are chiefly used by Universalists at this day. The explanations, also, which he gave of the passages commonly quoted against the doctrine, were, with a few exceptions, wholly different from such as were afterwards gradually adopted by us, in conformity with the natural principles of interpretation. The exceptions, themselves, or the writings in which they are found, may belong to a later period of his life, when he had given way to some of the improvements introduced by others.

Whatever we may think of his doctrines as a system of divinity, it would be a great oversight to forget that the prominent truth of universal salvation, in which they resulted, was like "life from the dead," to many in his age. That one truth, no matter in what form it was presented, cleared away the black mystery, if we may not say absolute atrociousness, from the divine perfections, and shed a serene light over the relations of the Creator with his

[28] Letters, &c. i. 58.

Digitized by Google

creatures. At this day, we can hardly conceive the sudden change of view, from a God of infinite wrath, and a world of eternal sin and torment, to a Father in heaven, who had secured, in his unerring administration, the final welfare of his entire family. It presented that reconciliation between God and his creation, which the moral sense of man, no less than his reason, so imperatively demands. It also satisfied the otherwise unappeasable want in every devout Christian heart, that the Christ, to whom it clings, should be impartial in his undertaking, and at the same time completely successful in the accomplishment. It answered the prayers of all saints, and gave free breathing to the deepest emotions of praise, which it is so difficult to repress within the limits of an imperfect faith. And in the blessed futurity which it opened before the whole human race, how many agonies of despair, how many helpless wrestlings with horror, were changed into boundless trust and joy! how much anguish of soul for kindred, or friends, or for mankind at large, into "the peace of God which passeth understanding"! We discover cases of this kind, in the scanty records of those days; and some of the fragments that remain, of the few early Universalist writings, are instinct with these sentiments. We suppose there must, of course, have been many, then as at all times, who "turned the grace of God into licentiousness;" we can see even that the Antinomian form, in which the doctrine was then presented, must have been unfavorable to the strenuous maintenance of moral as well as of religious discipline, notwithstanding the earnest exhortations to virtue and piety; nor do we forget that all sects, when new, are cess-pools, whither rush the streams of refuse that has been shut out from the established institutions of society. Still it is evident, that a large proportion of the early Universalists consisted of truly devout and zealous men, to whom their faith was a fountain of spiritual life. Many of them had come through "an horror of great darkness," into clear day. Indeed, there seems to have risen up simultaneously, in different parts of the country, a sense of unsatisfied wants, a longing for something more than the old systems of religion could give. The fierce excitement of the great "Revivals" had passed; their doctrinal elements were now left to their natural action on the living

Digitized by Google

organism of the human heart, and what rest was there for the soul? Here and there were individuals, especially among the Separatists and New-Lights, who, without concert, were painfully groping, each his solitary way, out of the stifling atmosphere of high Calvinism, to some freer issue.

It is supposed to have been about the year 1777, or 1778, that Elder Adam Streeter, a Baptist minister, residing probably in the vicinity of Cumberland, R. I., or in the neighboring parts of Massachusetts, became a Universalist. His career was short, and little is known of him; but, till his death, in 1786, he appears to have stood very high in the affectionate respect of Mr. Murray's congregations and immediate followers.[29] He was the first Universalist preacher born in America, unless we give this distinction to Mr. Rich. For three or four years, Caleb Rich, on the hills of Warwick, Mass., had been struggling out through the Calvinism of his Baptist brethren, towards visions of some unknown glory, and had arrived almost to the conclusion of Universalism. In the spring of 1778, he entered fully into the belief of that doctrine, without any communication with Murray, and began to preach. A church and society were, not long afterwards, formed; one branch of which was in Warwick, another in the neighboring town of Richmond, N. H., and the third in Jaffrey.[30] This region became a new, and at first an independent, centre of Universalism, where the doctrine was developed, if we mistake not, with some peculiar tendencies. As it was based, however, on high Calvinism, it easily coalesced, in its general form, with that of Relly; and the same, we suppose, may be said of the system held by Adam Streeter. The doctrine soon broke forth, as from another new centre, in the town and vicinity of Oxford, Mass. Mr. Rich had passed eight months, there, as far

[29] Is it not possible to recover some further notices of Elder Adam Streeter, in the records of the societies at Oxford, Milford, &c.? The character that tradition has handed down of him, and the part he acted, as one of the first preachers of Universalism, seem to demand that his memory should be better preserved.

[30] See Memoir of Elder Caleb Rich, in the "Candid Examiner," published at Montrose, Penn., April to June 18th, 1827,—among Whittemore's Collections.

Digitized by Google

back as 1775, when he was almost a Universalist; and, though not a preacher then, he had converted to his views some forty or fifty persons in that place and in the neighboring towns.[31] It is said that a Dr. Davis of Somers, Conn.,[32] sebsequently visited Oxford, and that he was the first to give the people clearer views of Universalism. This may have been about 1780.

In 1779, Mr. Murray's followers in Gloucester formed a society, as "Christian Independents," and, the next year, built their first meeting-house. These are the earliest instances of the kind. A society was formed in Oxford, probably but a little after 1780, of which Elder Streeter was, at one time, pastor. Mr. Murray had followers in Portsmouth, Boston, Providence, &c., to whom he, as well as Elder Streeter, preached occasionally; and we suppose there were numbers who still adhered to him, in most of the large towns along the sea-board, as far south as Philadelphia. In Norwich, Conn., the Episcopal clergyman, Mr. Tyler, had adopted his Universalism; and, though he was careful not to offend the "mother-church," it seems that he freely associated with Mr. Murray, visiting him at Gloucester,[33] and sometimes preaching, perhaps, to his congregations in other places.[34] In 1784, a society was formed at Portsmouth, N. H., and a meeting-house purchased of the Sandemanians; and, in the same year, if not still earlier, one of the members, Mr. Noah Parker, a convert and intimate friend of Murray, was elected pastor

[31] Memoir of Elder C. Rich. He had then renounced the doctrine of eternal punishment, but thought a part of Adam's posterity would be annihilated.

[32] Somers joins West Stafford, Conn., were Rev. Isaac Foster, pastor of the old Congregational parish, preached the doctrine of Universal Restoration, for many years. Had this circumstance any connexion with Dr. Davis's Universalism? Mr. Foster was the father of Revs. Dan Foster and John Foster.

[33] Answer to the Appeal, &c., p. 20, where Tyler is mentioned among the "strolling mendicants" with which "this town, (Gloucester,) has been infested," &c. This was published in Oct. 1785, — see last page.

[34] Murray's Letters, &c., ii. p. 357. I think this "Letter lxv. to Mr. I. T." is to Rev. John Tyler; evidently it is to an Episcopalian, who had preached to one of Murray's congregations, in O—, probably Oxford. For an account of Mr. Tyler, see Williams's "Hist. Sketch of Universalism in Norwich, Conn."

Digitized by Google

of the new congregation.[35] Probably, he had already preached to the people for a year or two. About this time, we think, Mr. Zephaniah Laithe, of Grafton, Mass., left the Calvinistic Baptists, and became a Universalist preacher.[36] Mr. Thomas Barns, who was converted, in 1782, from the Calvinistic Baptists, at Jaffrey, N. H., by the ministry of Mr. Rich, began to preach, in the state of Vermont, in 1784, or 1785.[37] We find notices, too, of a German Moravian, by the name of Wright, as an associate of Mr. Murray, and a preacher of Universalism, in Gloucester, Boston, &c. about this time. Mr. Shippie Townsend, not a preacher, but a merchant of Boston, should also be mentioned for the extensive influence he exerted in behalf of the cause. The six, whom we have named, were all the ministers we know of, at that early date, with the exception of one, who deserves a more particular notice than we have room to give.

Of all the early Universalist ministers, by far the most eminent for theological learning and intellectual power, combined with still greater moral and religious excellence, was Elhanan Winchester.[38] At first a very popular Baptist preacher, he became a convert to Universalism, at Philadelphia, early in 1781, after a conflict with doubts and hopes on the subject, for nearly three years. In the course of this protracted struggle, he went over from the iron Cal-

[35] Authority: Rev. M. Ballou, the present pastor of the Society. The Letters xvii,—xxviii., in Murray's Letters, &c. Vol. ii. are to Noah Parker,—compare Letter xxi. with Murray's Life, pp. 196, 197. Letter xvii. appears to have been written in 1782, when Murray first heard of Winchester's conversion, and when the pamphlet, "Salvation for all men," was published in Boston. In this letter, Mr. Parker is asked "How do your *hearers* conduct?"—do they begin to stay at home, complain that you are tedious, &c. Mrs. Murray also says that, in Feb. 1783, Mr. Parker was a "fellow-laborer," &c. Murray's Life, p. 196.

[36] Elder John Leland, in a letter to me, dated June, 1824, says that Mr. Laithe was converted, in 1772, under the ministry of Elhanan Winchester, then a Baptist preacher, at Grafton; and it seems that Mr. Laithe had become a Universalist preacher, before the Convention was held at Oxford, 1785. See Memoir of Caleb Rich, which, however, is inaccurate in its account of said Convention.

[37] Notice of Barns, Universalist Magazine, (Boston,) vol. vi. pp. 2, 3.

[38] For the account of Winchester, we refer in general to his Life, published in the Universalist Magazine, vi. pp. 189–196.

Digitized by Google

vinism of Dr. Gill, to a very moderate Calvinism, if not to downright Arminianism.[39] It was from this quarter that he approached Universalism, — the direction opposite to that which Murray had followed; and the form in which he finally received the doctrine, and the manner in which he treated it, were as different. His attention was first directed to the subject, (1778,) by looking into Siegvolck's "Everlasting Gospel;" and his conviction was at last hastened by reading (1780,) Stonehouse's "Restitution of all Things," — works, in which the doctrine was argued on the general ground of Dr. Chauncy's subsequent publication, "The Salvation of all Men."

We need not describe Winchester's views of religion at large, since they differed but little from the present popular "Orthodoxy," except in regard to the duration and design of future punishment, and the ultimate salvation of all moral creatures, whether men or angels. He found, in the Scriptures, explicit recognitions of a period, when all things should be gathered together in Christ; when all things should be reconciled to God, through him; when all things should be subdued to him, and God become all in all; when every knee should bow, and every tongue confess, &c. Besides these, there were, in all parts of the Bible, many evident references to such a final consummation. The very plan of salvation, as revealed in the Scriptures, also involved Universalism; for God would have all men to be saved, and for that purpose sent his Son, who gave himself a ransom for all, — a purpose that could never be abandoned. And then, again, he saw the same result secured by the perfections of God: the divine nature could not fail to triumph eventually over all evil, and to remove it from the universe; almighty power, omniscience, and infinite love could issue only in the sanctification and blessedness of all intelligent creatures. The objections, urged from the Scripture language, "everlasting fire, punishment," &c., "for ever, for ever and ever," &c., he answered, by showing the ambiguous use of these epithets and qualifying phrases, and by lexicographical criticisms on the force of the original terms. Other texts, adduced as objections, he explained by their contexts, or by

[39] Winchester's Dialogues, Preface, pp. viii, ix: Boston, 1831.

Digitized by Google

parallel passages, according to the commonly received principles of interpretation.[40] In doing this, he usually argued with good sense, and always with perfect candor; a cavil, or a sleight-of-hand treatment of a text, would have been an impossibility with his open-hearted sincerity and serious temper. Though, like most of the cotemporary divines, and even Biblical scholars, he relied too much on the mere verbal relations of particular texts, and therefore did not give free scope to the general purport of the discourse; and though he sometimes ran into downright enthusiasm, in accepting as literal the gorgeous imagery of the prophecies and apocalyptic visions; yet so far as we know, he was ths first to introduce, among the Universalists, any thing that can be called Scripture interpretation. The fundamental principles of his method, somewhat enlarged indeed, and modified by the general improvements of half a century, as well as by our own revisions, are those on which we now explain the Bible, or any other book.

His peculiar views of the intermediate state, and of futurity (*Eschatology*,) were the following: Immediately after his crucifixion, the soul of Christ went first to Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43,) and there announced, to the waiting expectant saints of all former ages, salvation through his blood just shed. Then he descended to hell, in the lower parts of the earth, and there "preached to the spirits in prison," (1. Pet. iii. iv,) some of whom were thus converted. At his ascension, the souls both of the ancient believers in Paradise, and of the recent believers in Gehenna, followed him in his triumphal progress into heaven, (Ps. lxviii. 18, Eph. iv. 8,) and were received with him into glory.—Before the end of the world, the bodies of all saints shall be raised, and they shall reign personally with Christ, a thousand years, on earth, in all terrestrial as well as spiritual enjoyments. At the close of this period, a general apostasy will follow the loosing of Satan; and, subsequently, the innumerable hosts of rebels will be destroyed, in a most terrible manner, by fire from heaven. Then shall come the second resurrection, and universal Judgement, (Rev. xx.) This will be held on our earth. The

[40] See his Dialogues, *passim*.

Digitized by Google

separation having been made, and the doom pronounced, the righteous shall follow Christ in his return to the highest heaven; while the wicked shall be left behind for punishment, (Matt. xxv.) The earth will then be melted, by the final conflagration, into a lake of fire, the horrible abode of lost men and angels, for ages of ages. Their unutterable sufferings, however, will at length bring them to submission; though some of the most perverse may continue obstinate, perhaps, till the fifty-thousandth year, — answering to the Mosaic Jubilee of the fiftieth year. But when the earth shall have been thoroughly purified by the flames, and all rebels, angelic as well as human, brought to repentance, the new heavens and earth shall appear, and universal blessedness be complete. The Son shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and God be all in all.[41]

It was impossible that such a system should coalesce with Relly's; not so much, however, on account of its different form, as by reason of its different elements throughout, and because the result, though nearly the same, was nevertheless obtained by quite other laws of Biblical interpretation and of reasoning. Both systems, indeed, were founded on Christ and on the authority of the Scriptures, and were thus united on a common basis. But from this basis upward, they spread asunder, and every thing tended in contrary directions. Murray was, ere long, made aware of this difference, by report; yet he wrote to the distinguished convert in very friendly and encouraging terms.[42] It is probable, however, that nothing but Winchester's personal meekness, forbearance and affectionate temper could have prevented a collision, when the two systems were brought into the same field of action. His immediate followers regarded the doctrine of Murray as unfavorable to holiness;[43] while his own system was looked upon by the others in turn, as proposing salvation by works,[44] instead of being the gospel of free and "finish-

[41] See his Process and Empire of Christ, &c. A Poem. Books iii. v. viii — xii.

[42] Murray's Letters, &c. ii. pp. 287, & on, written "many months" after hearing of Winchester's change, and probably about 1782. See preceding Note 35.

[43] Murray's Letters, &c. ii. p. 112, iii. p. 359.

[44] Murray's Letters, &c. i. p. 348, ii. pp. 112, 113 and 277, (written

Digitized by Google

ed" justification. Winchester preached repentance and regeneration on nearly the same ground with the common "Orthodoxy," and, of course, in strong contradistinction from Relly's Antinomianism. Though he occasionally visited the North, yet his ministry appears to have been confined chiefly to the neighborhood of Philadelphia, for five or six years; so that it was some time before his views can have had much influence in the region which Murray occupied. When the latter became personally acquainted with him, at Philadelphia, (probably in 1783,)[45] he was completely won by his unassuming gentleness and warm Christian sympathy, welcomed him as a fellow-laborer, and, we think, ever afterwards continued to speak of him with high commendation. He often treated even his system with a hearty tolerance, in circumstances when to do so required some magnanimity on his part;[46] but at other times he could not suppress a deep dislike of its principles, nor a wariness, and eventually a sore jealousy, of its encroachments on his cause.[47]

For the present, however, Murray had vexations nearer home. He had already been mortified with perverse fancies that sprang out of the movement which he himself had produced. Some of the believers, in New England, were pushing his mode of interpretation to the wildest excesses. One preacher held that "they who had done good, and who were to come forth to the resurrection of life," were none other than Christ, who alone had done good, and in whom all men rose to life.[48] Some speculatists had discovered that Christ was the scape-goat,

immediately after Noah Parker's death. in 1787,) iii. pp. 358, 359 written in 1791.

[45] Murray's Letters, &c. i. pp. 342—351. There are two or three points in this long "Letter xi.," that go to fix its date. 1. It was written after his Letter xvii. to Noah Parker in 1782 when he had not seen Winchester, (see preceding note 35;) and before Sept. 1785 when he met him at Oxford. 2. It was before the army was disbanded, p. 351. 3. It was just before harvest p. 342. I put it, therefore, in Aug. 1783. In the same journey, Murray visited Potter's grave at Cranberry Inlet, pp. 335—341. Mr. Potter, therefore, died some years before 1783.

[46] Letters, &c. i. 386, 387, ii. 264.

[47] Letters, &c. i. 349: ii. 130, 263, 277: iii. 358, 359, — the last, written in 1791, shows some irritation.

[48] Letters, &c. i. 278. Written, I think, a little after 1780.

Digitized by Google

(Lev. xvi. 8,) which, on the contrary, was the devil; that Christ was the man, in the parable, who had not on a wedding-garment; that he was also the tares of the field; that he was typified by Pharaoh, Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and even by Lucifer.[49] It is easy to see whence these extravagances arose, — from the habit of regarding Christ as embodying all our sins in himself, and suffering all our punishment, and from certain interpretations, equally perverse, which we have mentioned in former pages. Some denied a future judgement, and the existence of angels, and of the devil. In a letter to Noah Parker, (written of course before Parker's death in 1787,) Murray speaks of these Universalists with horror; and with strong disapprobation of another class, who held to "purgatorial satisfaction,"—alluding either to Winchester's followers, or perhaps to some earlier believers in the "Restoration."[50] This doctrine had been somewhat agitated among the Congregational clergy; and it would be strange if it had not found its way, from that quarter, into the circle of Murray's adherents. He thought "no description of people further from Christianity, true Christianity, than such Universalians."

In this state of things, Winchester's views appear to have had considerable effect, at length, on the Universalist preachers in New England. As early as 1787, Murray writes to a friend in London, "I do not now know a single preacher in this country, if I except Mr. T. [Tyler,] of Connecticut, who is with me in sentiment respecting gospel truth, although there are many private Christians who are happy in the belief of those glad tidings which the angels delighted to proclaim. There are, as I informed you in my last, who preach another gospel; who assure us that all mankind will finally, through their own doings and sufferings, enter into life, forasmuch as God willeth that all men should be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth. Of this number is Mr. W. [Winchester,] who is now in England.[51] We are not to sup-

[49] Letters, &c. ii. 92 — (written in 1782) — 110, 111, 130.

[50] Letters, &c. ii. 130, 131.

[51] Letters, &c. ii. 277. Written immediately after the death of Noah Parker in 1787. In this, as in other letters, Murray expresses great anxiety and distress, in view of the state of Universalism, and its tendencies.

Digitized by Google

pose that the seven or eight ministers, of this time, had adopted Winchester's system in full; but his influence had modified their views of Scripture doctrine, and of the economy of salvation. It was a new element, that was silently breaking up the old forms of thought, and producing other combinations; though these were still quite various, and in the crudest state. Indeed, we must look forward, several years, to see its full power put forth; for it was not till Winchester's return from England, in 1794, that his works were much read, or known, in this country. Afterwards, they were circulated, at least in the interior of New England, far more extensively, we think, than those of Relly or Murray have ever been.

Meanwhile, other influences were operating, which prevented his system, as well as that of Relly, from gaining a general acceptance. The ardor of speculation, which had been kindled, would not be controlled in its course, nor regulated. Though the impulses, given by the one or the other system, were still felt, and though particular ideas and technical forms of expression were retained from them, yet the tendency in all quarters was to new conclusions. On looking into the confused state of opinion, among Universalists, about the year 1791, we dimly discover a mass of fantastic shadows, with a few principles of a more substantial character. The notions appear to range, through all the intermediate varieties, from absolute Antinomianism to Arminianism, and from a doctrine of universal equality at death, on Rellyan grounds, to that of Restoration after ages of torment.[52] It was a time of transition, and everything was chaotic. If we turn from the general body of Universalists, to the preachers, it would appear that, with them, the scheme of Murray was, ere long, felt to be too factitious throughout; that of Winchester, too fanciful in some of its definitions, and too severe, if not cruel, in its terrible code of punishments. In both systems, there were certain premises, brought over from the old creeds, which were open to objection. In particular, the prominent doctrines of the trinity and of the penal sufferings of Christ, on which the one was based, and which

[52] Letters, &c. iii. 349—364.

Digitized by Google

the other maintained, were found to be unreasonable in themselves, and unsupported by Scripture.

So far as we can learn, the first to discard these tenets, (about 1800,) was Mr. Ballou, now of Boston. The other ministers gradually followed him in this reform; and, as early as 1805, the work may be said to have been completed, though Mr. Murray at Boston, and Mr. Mitchell at New York, still maintained the former views with great strenuousness. But from this time onwards, the Universalist ministry, in this country, has, with only three or four exceptions, publicly avowed, and often defended, Unitarian sentiments on these points, both in the pulpit and from the press. In other respects, however, the prevalent Universalism, of this date, retained some of the old Rellyan influences, which partially dominated over the developement of the new principles, and which, indeed, have not quite spent their force, down to our own day. Still, the more rational and Scriptural elements, that had been introduced, were slowly gaining the ascendancy.

We have been obliged, by want of space, to change our plan, and to pass over the latter half of this period with only a few hints. Indeed, we found the earlier portion of our work much more perplexing and laborious, than we had anticipated, on account of the confusion, as well as scantiness, of the materials. The letters of Murray, on which we have largely drawn, are published in a very disordered state, — for the most part dateless and nameless, here a single initial, there none. By a careful perusal, and thorough collocation, they might be brought into chronological arrangement, and many of their personal references ascertained. In this way, they may be made of great service to the historian of our denomination.

We close, with a brief sketch of the increase of Universalists, from the year 1785, which we have gathered chiefly from the Records of our General Convention.

The first Universalist Association, the germ of our present General Convention, was formed at Oxford, Mass., in 1785. Besides nine lay-delegates, there were three preachers present, as members, viz., Elhanan Winchester, of Philadelphia, Moderator; John Murray, of Gloucester,

Digitized by Google

and Caleb Rich, of Warwick.[53] It is thought that Zephaniah Laithe, of Grafton, also attended, but declined membership on some scruples about written compacts.[54] Four others were then known as Universal preachers: Noah Parker in Portsmouth; Adam Streeter, perhaps in Rhode Island; Thomas Barns in Vermont; and Moses Winchester,[55] a half-brother of Elhanan, in the Middle States. The next record we have of the Convention, is that of 1793. At this time, we believe, there were twelve or thirteen preachers; Adam Streeter and Noah Parker having died. Besides the societies in Portsmouth, Gloucester, Boston, and Philadelphia, there appear to have been small bodies of Universalists scattered in different parts of Worcester County, Mass., especially in the southern part, and in the neighboring towns of Connecticut; in the vicinity of Warwick, Mass., and Richmond, N. H.; from Clarendon, Vt., and Whitehall, N. Y., to Ballston, N. Y.; in the neighborhoods of Langdon and Warner, N. H.; around Norwich, Ct.; and Providence, R. I. In 1801, the list of "approved ministers and elders," contains twenty-two. In 1805, there were three branches of the Convention, viz., the Northern Association, in the central part of Vermont; the Western Association, in Central New York; and the Eastern Association, in the region back of Portland, Me. The number of ministers, at that time, cannot be ascertained with precision. H. B., 2D.

53 Murray's Life, Append. B., 241, 242.

54 Memoir of Elder Caleb Rich. There are some mistakes, however, in its account of this Convention.

55 Answer to the Appeal, &c. p. 20, where "a duplicate of Winchesters" (meaning Elhanan and Moses,) is mentioned among those who, in the train of Murray, had "infested" Gloucester, as early as 1785.

Digitized by Google

Art. VII.

Evangeline.

Evangeline, a Tale of Acadie. By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Third Edition. Boston: William D. Ticknor & Co. 1848.

Owing to the present state of opinion among critics relative to Mr. Longfellow's poetic merits, the appearance of a new and lengthy poem from his pen is an interesting literary event. Especially if, as in the present instance, it comes in an unusual dress and upon a novel theme. Those who have complained of the mannerism of Mr. Longfellow's verse, who have denied to him the possession of any original power, and called attention to the narrow range of his subjects and the monotony of his thought, certainly must be staggered a little by an introduction to a work of some 160 pages, written in hexameters and exhibiting the blended charms of pastoral simplicity, narrative interest, and descriptive clearness and variety. We regard "Evangeline" as a final answer to the attacks of those wanton critics who have been either blind to the author's real powers, or envious of his fame. It is not our intention, however, to attempt any original estimate here of Mr. L.'s poetic gifts. Measured by the standard of Shakspeare and Milton, he is not, it may be, so great; measured by the standard of newspaper sonneteers, he is not so small. Safe and convenient as this judgment may seem, if it should be always kept in sight by critics, the intricacy of the problem which our author's works present, would be greatly simplified and reduced.

We have been so much delighted with "Evangeline," that the task of introducing it to the readers of this journal is a very pleasant one. Neither inclination nor opportunity will enable us to attempt any formal review of its merits and defects. The extracts will tell their own story. Particularly do we regret that entire ignorance as to the proper structure of hexameter verse — perhaps the last disqualification in a reviewer — will compel us to keep silent concerning the dress of the poem. We can only say that the lines flow on so easily, that no suggestions of labor or

Digitized by Google

art disturb the reader, although some address the ear with a more winning cadence, and musical flexibility than others, leading us to suppose that, though the feet may be accurate in each verse, there is a little inequality in the artistic finish of different passages, and the rhythmical collocation of syllables.

The work is a versified tale. The heroine is the daughter of a French Acadian farmer, Benedict Bellefontaine, and is the pride of the village of Grand-Pré. She is beloved by all the youth of the village, but her heart is given to Gabriel Lajeunesse, "the son of Basil the blacksmith." The following passage will exhibit the author's power of picture painting, while it is a fair specimen of the melody of the verse, and the poetic power of the execution. It is a description of Benedict and Evangeline.—(pp. 13–15.)

"Stalwart and stately in form was the man of seventy winters;
Hearty and hale was he, an oak that is covered with snow-flakes;
White as the snow were his locks, and his cheeks as brown as the oak-leaves.
Fair was she to behold, that maiden of seventeen summers.
Black were her eyes as the berry that grows on the thorn by the way-side,
Black, yet how softly they gleamed beneath the brown shade of her tresses!
Sweet was her breath as the breath of kine that feed in the meadows.
When in the harvest heat she bore to the reapers at noontide
Flagons of home-brewed ale, ah! fair in sooth was the maiden.
Fairer was she when, on Sunday morn, while the bell from its turret
Sprinkled with holy sounds the air, as the priest with his hyssop
Sprinkles the congregation, and scatters blessings upon them,
Down the long street she passed, with her chaplet of beads and her missal,
Wearing her Norman cap, and her kirtle of blue, and the ear-rings,
Brought in the olden time from France, and since, as an heirloom,
Handed down from mother to child, through long generations.
But a celestial brightness — a more ethereal beauty —
Shone on her face and encircled her form, when, after confession,
Homeward serenely she walked with God's benediction upon her.
When she had passed, it seemed like the ceasing of exquisite music."

Take the following description of an evening during Indian Summer in Acadie, as a specimen of idyllic beauty of the piece.—(pp. 25–28.)

"Now recommenced the reign of rest and affection and stillness.
Day with its burden and heat had departed, and twilight descending

Digitized by Google

Brought back the evening star to the sky, and the herds to the homestead.
Pawing the ground they came, and resting their necks on each other,
And with their nostrils distended inhaling the freshness of evening.
Foremost, bearing the bell, Evangeline's beautiful heifer,
Proud of her snow-white hide, and the ribbon that waved from her collar,
Quietly paced and slow, as if conscious of human affection.
Then came the shepherd back with his bleating flocks from the sea-side,
Where was their favorite pasture. Behind them followed the watch-dog,
Patient, full of importance, and grand in the pride of his instinct,
Walking from side to side with a lordly air, and superbly
Waving his bushy tail, and urging forward the stragglers;
Regent of flocks was he when the shepherd slept; their protector,
When from the forest at night, through the starry silence, the wolves howled;
Late, with the rising moon, returned the wains from the marshes,
Laden with briny hay, that filled the air with its odor.
Cheerily neighed the steeds, with dew on their manes and their fetlocks.
While aloft on their shoulders the wooden and ponderous saddles,
Painted with brilliant dyes, and adorned with tassels of crimson,
Nodded in bright array, like hollyhocks heavy with blossoms.
Patiently stood the cows meanwhile, and yielded their udders
Unto the milkmaid's hand; whilst loud and in regular cadence
Into the sounding pail the foaming streamlets descended.
Lowing of cattle and peals of laughter were heard in the farm-yard,
Echoed back by the barns. Anon they sank into stillness;
Heavily closed, with a creaking sound, the valves of the barn-doors,
Rattled the wooden bars, and all for a season was silent."

Gabriel and Evangeline were betrothed. The picture of the village festivity on the occasien is presented thus:—(pp. 51–53.)

"Under the open sky, in the odorous air of the orchard,
Bending with golden fruit, was spread the feast of betrothal.
There in the shade of the porch were the priest and the notary seated;
There good Benedict sat, and sturdy Basil the blacksmith.
Not far withdrawn from these, by the cider-press and the beehives,
Michael the fidder was placed, with the gayest of hearts and of waistcoats.
Shadow and light from the leaves alternately played on his show-white
Hair, as it waved in the wind; and the jolly face of the fiddler
Glowed like a living coal when the ashes are blown from the embers.
Gayly the old man sang to the vibrant sound of his fiddle,
Tous les Bourgeois de Chartres, and *Le Carillon de Dunkerque*,
And anon with his wooden shoes beat time to the music.
Merrily, merrily whirled the wheels of the dizzying dances
Under the orchard-trees and down the path to the meadows;
Old folk and young together, and children mingled among them.

Digitized by Google

Fairest of all the maids was Evangeline, Benedict's daughter!
Noblest of all the youths was Gabriel, son of the blacksmith!"

Everything seems to promise a life of simple joy and plenty for the young pair. But now in the Gasperean's mouth appear some English war-ships, and the French inhabitants of the village of Grand-Pré are summoned to hear the judgment of the English government. Their goods are forfeited to the crown, and they are condemned to exile in other lands. The horrors of war are vividly painted in a few sketches — Evangeline's father dies of a broken heart, on the sea-shore, and in the confusion of the departure, Gabriel and Evangeline are borne away in different vessels and arrive in the American colonies at different times. The interest of the story now consists in the search of Evangeline for her lover, a search which carries her through the most remarkable portions of our country, and the narrative of which affords the finest opportunity for natural sketches, and ever varying descriptions of landscape and scenery. We have no room for a transcript of any specimen of Mr. Longfellow's success in this line, although we had marked some fine passages from pages 96, 107, and 122.

The affectionate diligence of Evangeline in seeking the absent Gabriel, is fruitless. He is continually flying before her, and they do not meet until the hour of his death, when she discovers him among some sufferers, to whom, as a sister of charity, she is bearing relief. No poet among us can compare with Mr. Longfellow for chasteness of illustration, and classic purity of fancy. The following passage we take to be the finest instance of both, which we have seen in the present volume.—(p. 95.)

"Dreamlike, and indistinct, and strange were all things around them;
And o'er their spirits there came a feeling of wonder and sadness,—
Strange forebodings of ill, unseen and that cannot be compassed.
As, at the tramp of a horse's hoof on the turf of the prairies,
Far in advance are closed the leaves of the shrinking mimosa,
So, at the hoof-beats of fate, with sad forebodings of evil,
Shrinks and closes the heart, ere the stroke of doom has attained it.
But Evangeline's heart was sustained by a vision, that faintly
Floated before her eyes, and beckoned her on through the moonlight."

A passage, too, on p. 121, contains a singularly fine simile.

Digitized by Google

Some lines, however, on p. 74 contain a stroke of fancy which, to us, is more grotesque than clear:

"Suddenly rose from the south a light, as in autumn the blood-red
Moon climbs the crystal walls of heaven, and o'er the horizon
Titan-like stretches its hundred hands upon mountain and meadow,
Seizing the rocks and the rivers, and piling huge shadows together."

An allusion to Evangeline, moreover, on p. 145, presents a metaphor which, we think, violates all propriety of fancy:

"Fair was she and young, when in hope began the long journey;
Faded was she and old, when in disappointment it ended.
Each succeeding year stole something away from her beauty,
Leaving behind it, broader and deeper, the gloom and the shadow.
Then there appeared and spread faint streaks of gray o'er her forehead,
Dawn of another life, that broke o'er her earthly horizon,
As in the eastern sky the first faint streaks of the morning."

We would not close our notice without an allusion to one or two defects that appear amid such a flood of beauties, and therefore will call attention to the lines on the religious influence of sorrow upon Evangeline's mind:

"As from a mountain's top the rainy mists of the morning
Roll away, and afar we behold the landscape below us,
Sun-illumined, with shining rivers and cities and hamlets,
So fell the mists from her mind, and she saw the world far below her,
Dark no longer, but all illumined with love; and the pathway
Which she had climbed so far, lying smooth and fair in the distance.
Gabriel was not forgotten. Within her heart was his image,
Clothed in the beauty of love and youth, as last she beheld him,
Only more beautiful made by his deathlike silence and absence.
Into her thoughts of him time entered not, for it was not.
Over him years had no power; he was not changed, but transfigured;
He had become to her heart as one who is dead, and not absent;
Patience and abnegation of self, and devotion to others,
This was the lesson a life of trial and sorrow had taught her.
So was her love diffused, but, like to some odorous spices,
Suffered no waste nor loss, though filling the air with aroma.
Other hope had she none, nor wish in life, but to follow
Meekly, with reverent steps, the sacred feet of her Saviour."

The effect of "Evangeline" is certainly most elevating and hallowing. When the perusal is finished, it seems, indeed, "like the ceasing of exquisite music." It is a Christian poem. Was it not intended to be a symbolic picture of the author's conception of religion? and in the

Digitized by Google

removal of Evangeline from a scene of quiet but enervating ease, where she would have lived and died a farmer's wife, and in the long and trustful search of a good which ever eludes pursuit, but which on the borders of the grave points to another and better state, has not the poet veiled and suggested the benevolence of discipline, the strengthening power of sorrow, the hunger of the heart, for a beauty and a good which this life cannot furnish, which invites and escapes us here, and which, while it educates the sentiments of faith and trust, is the clearest natural evidence of immortality? T. S. K.

Art. VIII.

Literary Notices.

1. A Commentary on the New Testament. By Lucius R. Paige. Volume III. Acts of the Apostles, &c. Boston: B. B. Mussey & Co., 29 Cornhill, &c. 1848. 12mo. pp. 321.

Having noticed the two preceding volumes of this Commentary, as they were published, we have, now, but little to say on the general character of the work. Thus far, it has exceeded the anticipations, favorable as they were, which we had formed, from the well-known qualifications of the author. If we do not mistake, the execution of the successive volumes evinces a gradual improvement in tact and workmanship, arising perhaps from increasing practice in this kind of writing. In the present volume, the notes appear, to us, to spring more directly from the text, to be more immediately connected with it in form, and to adhere more closely to it; and we think that the doctrinal and practical inferences, occasionally offered, are confined more nearly to such as the subject naturally suggests. These improvements add, not only to the neatness of the work, but to the convenience and satisfaction of the reader.

One thing which we regard as an important excellence, in this Commentary, is the definiteness, the precision in which the author aims to give the meaning and force of the sacred language. The text is never shaded off into indistinctness, so as to be about as applicable to one thing as to another; the original idea is never gener-

Digitized by Google

alized, till its outline is lost in a haze; but the exact thought of the writer is sought for, that it may be presented in its own form. In rigorously following out this plan, every Commentator is, of course, liable to mistake, at times. The side of danger, will be that of too narrow an interpretation. But, better to fall into mistakes of this kind, here and there, than to throw a universal mist over the the sacred page. In the one case, the error is particular and occasional; in the other, universal.

Wherever the salvation of all men is taught, or implied in the New Testament, it is no more than the duty of the Commentator to bring it distinctly forward. Yet we do not think that Mr. Paige can be justly accused of eagerness to *press* passages into the service of that doctrine. Some texts, which many Universalists have used in support of their peculiar faith, he explains otherwise, and we think correctly. Acts ii. 21, is of this class: "— the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began," — that is, the restitution, or fulfilling, of all those things which had been predicted by the holy prophets. We do not suppose that, by "the times of restitution," St. Peter alluded directly to what is called "universal restoration." See Matt. xvii. 11, where the verb, translated "restoreth," perfectly corresponds with the noun here translated "restitution." The meaning, we think, is well expressed by the Commentator: "The heavens should retain Jesus, until the accomplishment of all things predicted concerning this period. . . . One of those predictions is cited, as a sample, in [the following] verses, 22, 23. This is one of those general expressions which must necessarily be limited by the subject to which it is applied." But let the reader consult the whole of the Note.

There is another passage which we are inclined to interpret in manner different from that in which Universalists have sometimes used it. We refer to Acts x. 15 and 28; where it is said that St. Peter was taught to "call no man common or unclean." To us, the attending circumstances and the specific application which St. Peter makes of this instruction, seem to limit the direct reference to the case of the Gentiles relatively to the Jews. The former were no longer to be regarded as "unclean," in any such sense as that it should be unlawful, as heretofore, for a Jew to associate with them: "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or to come unto one of another nation; *but* God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean." His scruples, as to associating with a Gentile, were now removed.

Digitized by Google

2. The Rose of Sharon: A Religious Souvenir for M DCCC XLVIII. Edited by Mrs. S. C. Edgarton Mayo. Boston: A. Tompkins, and B. B. Mussey & Co. 1848. 16mo. pp. 304.

Our favorite Annual comes to us, this year, with its usual proportion of interesting and well-written articles, and with visible improvement in the style of its mechanical execution. The pages are certainly beautiful, and the illustrations handsome even when compared with the best engravings. It must be difficult, we should think, to furnish, for nine successive years, the requisite novelty, variety and excellence of matter, within the range of topics usually embraced in w›rks of this kind; yet the fair Editor's resources are apparantly undiminished. We might mention some of the short tales that are good examples of simple, natural, chaste story-telling. Of the other prose articles, some glow with a quiet humor, or smile with good-natured satire, and some impress on us lessons of duty in earnest and eloquent language. We should not, indeed, have looked for set pleas in favor of Fourierism under the title of the Rose, nor for certain other fancies in a Religious Souvenir, designed for our family circles. But we know how hard it is to reject a contribution that has been asked for, though it prove, on receipt, very different from what was anticipated. An Editor, however, must not always suspend the power of the *veto*. We were, once, astonished at finding, where we least could have expected it, a half-irresolute, but rather coolly ventured, commendation of Shelley — the atheist, the unmarried husband and father, the unflinching defier of all laws but his own, — as an elect emissary of Heaven to win a corrupt world over to the service of spiritual Truth, Goodness and Beauty, and as comparable to Luther, the ancient prophets, &c. That piece, however, is not in this volume; and we may, therefore, be excused for passing it by thus lightly.

Much of the poetry in this volume is good, and some of it beautiful. The former part of St. Valentine's Eve, especially, is distinguished, not merely for artistic design and finish, which, when alone, rank no higher than other ornaments, — it is alive with deep and chastened feeling, which is the plastic power of all real poetry.

"Eight years ago, this night, my love,
I met thee at the village ball;
Oh fair were many maidens there,
But thou the fairest of them all!
Like a soft breeze along the sea,
Thy form went waving through the dance,
While I stood by as though some power
Were holding me in trance."

Digitized by Google

The sixth line rises almost into the magic region of Burns. We wish we had space for the seven following stanzas; the last four, though nearly equal in themselves, do not change the tone so as to accord with the change of scene, and, on this account, they seem to us no proper appendage. But the author of the former part needs no other voucher of that rarest of gifts, the true poetic inspiration. There is a great difference between fossilized poetry, if so we may call it, manufactured crystallizations of it, however perfect, artistic specimens made for the casket,—and the living, wonder-working spirit of song that wakens the chords in every heart. A low ambition is apt to strive for the former, as the court beauty aspires to rouge and brilliants; but, out of court, these are a poor exchange for the natural glow of carnation which God himself has spread on the cheek.

Digitized by Google

Art. IX.

Miracles, and the Laws of Nature.

A habit of close and connected thinking and reasoning, and a correct use of language, are important acquirments, the attainment of which is a sufficient reward for all the labor and discipline it may require. But though this is very generally allowed, it is seldom we meet with the exactness so desirable in this respect, and so essential to the developement of truth. And nowhere, perhaps, is this fact more apparent than in the theological and philosophical discussions and inquiries of the present time. There is an affectation of metaphysical acumen, of deep research, of nicety and scientific accuracy in the use of language, while at the same time, nothing is more glaring than the exceedingly loose and vague manner in which words and terms are employed; — nothing more absurd than the grave and self-satisfied air with which illogical conclusions, jumped at from false premises, are set forth as the established and unquestionable results of a rigid and scientific analysis of the subject in hand.

The discussion of the question of miracles furnishes a fair illustration of this. In connection with this subject, there is much talk of "nature," "laws of nature," "violation of the laws of nature," &c. And it is to be feared that, mostly, these expressions do not represent any fixed and clearly defined thought or idea; but are employed in a vague, misty way, as indicative of some kind of power, the character and source of which is little understood, if at all. Now to enable us to arrive at any results valuable to the cause of truth, we must first endeavor to affix some precise and definite value to this kind of phraseology. As a foundation to our inquiry, we shall seek to accomplish this, here, in the outset. Of course we write for the theist, or the believer in the existence and government of a God — and not for the atheist, reasoning with whom the argument would take quite another form.

Digitized by Google

What then do we mean by nature? Reduced to its simplest form, the answer may be stated thus: The external universe, with all its collocations and arrangements; including all the forms and dispositions of matter, and also all the elements of the human mind and body.

We often speak of nature as intelligent and active. We say nature does this, or produces that, or brings about such a result. There is perhaps no objection to this use of terms, if in the mind the words are kept subordinate to facts. It is common to transfer the action or power of the principal to the agent. We say of a general, he defeated the enemy, he conquered the territory, &c. In a subordinate sense this is true; but strictly, following the stream to its source, it was the government which did this. The general is nothing without men and means. The government, which stands behind and above him, and furnishes aid and strength, men, armament and food, is the actual power; and uses him and his as instruments to accomplish its purposes. So nature, in this sense, may be said to do this or that, to work out certain results; but we should be careful not to confound the instrument with Him who uses it; careful not to set up nature in the place of God, in place of the Infinite Mind that lies behind it, and moves it, and works through it.

And now a word respecting the laws of nature. On this point there is a large measure of talking and writing which seems to regard the laws of nature as intelligent, active agents, having force in themselves. Nothing seems more unreasonable, or displays a more vague use of language. What do we mean by law? Surely not an active agent, not power; but only method, a rule, a way of doing anything. There is no force in the law itself. It is not a cause, but an effect; and implies mind, plan, will, as its source. For example: we have a law relating to the collection of taxes and customs, a law respecting the election of officers and magistrates. These laws are nothing of themselves; but simply the expression of the will of the people or the sovereign, which is the cause of their existence; and they may be repealed on a change of circumstances, or in the regular expected progress of affairs, and new ones substituted. They have no force in themselves to collect revenue or taxes, or to cast votes, or

Digitized by Google

cause it to be done. They simply prescribe the method in which these things shall be done, the rule by which the desired result shall be obtained. The power to do lies behind them. And, indeed, that law of itself has no active force, is confessed by the appointment of what is called the executive power, the governor and magistrates; whose duty it is to see the law executed, or the particular business or act done in the way and manner set forth.

So with any piece of machinery: a steam engine, for example. The laws of the machine are only the method or order according to which it operates. They have no power to move the machinery, no power to set it in motion, or, when this is done, to keep it in motion. The moving power, which in this case is steam, is entirely independent of the laws of the machine. And, what is worthy of note, the moment this power is withdrawn, the machine stops; and, with all its laws, is perfectly helpless, dead and useless.

So with the laws of nature. They are nothing more than the method in which, or the rule by which, given results are brought about in the physical, moral and spiritual worlds—as the revolution of the planets on their axis, and round a central controling body; the transmission of light and sound through the atmosphere; the growth, maturity, and decay of animals and vegetables; the action of the elements, so called; the developement of the mental faculties, and the social sentiments and passions. Here we have certain results. The laws of nature are the method or manner according to which they are brought about, but they have no power or force in themselves to produce these results. The producing power, or the cause of these results, is the infinite energy or will of God. Without him these effects could not come about. Withdraw his all-sustaining and acting energy from nature, and the whole fabric would fall into helpless and shapeless ruin. It is the pressure of his omnipotent will upon the universe that keeps it in existence, and its wheels revolving.

I may not know how it is that the mind or will of God acts thus directly on physical nature; but that it does is certain. I do not know how it is that my will acts upon this right hand, with which I am now making record of my thoughts; but that it does act is perfectly clear. I write with it, raise it, extend it, do what I please with it, by a

Digitized by Google

simple act of the will. It is a mystery which no man can explain. The method is unknown, but the fact is indisputable. We may talk learnedly of brain, nerves, muscles, &c., but it is only a vain attempt to conceal the fact, that we cannot penetrate to the real source of the mystery, or detect the secret of the spirit's action on matter, or of its connection with it. So we cannot explain how God acts on nature, or through it; nevertheless, we feel that it is the pressure of his infinite will that keeps the machinery running; while the laws according to which it runs, which laws he has imposed upon it, are only the method in which he brings about determined results and events.

Nature, then, has no laws but the laws of God; or, in other words, the laws of nature are the rules by which God works. Indeed, following the inquiry to its last analysis, there is but one law, supreme and universal, viz., the original plan of God; the system according to which in the beginning he proposed to accomplish his purposes. This is the highest, the first and last; and all other laws are subordinate to, and are but partial exhibitions of, this one all-comprehending law. This law reveals itself in various ways, but though the forms are manifold, the spirit and purpose are one. There may be "diversities of operations, but it is the same God that worketh all in all."

This being the case, then the universe in all its developements and operations, is but the outward expression of the mind or will of God; the material embodiment or utterance of his thought, in the same manner that a machine is the material expression of the thought and intention of the inventor. From a careful examination of the machine, from understanding its workings, its uses and ends, we discover the purpose of the inventor, the particular object he sought. And when in operation we find it works according to the laws of its construction, and produces, in the prescribed way, such results as he pre-determined and willed it should produce. The nature of its structure, the relation of its parts, the laws or method of its working, and the character of its productions, are all of the maker; as it were, his thought crystalized, taking a material form.

So from an examination of the structure and arrangements of the universe, from the faculties and endowments of man, and his position and relations in the scale of be-

Digitized by Google

ing, we discover, so to speak, what thought was in the mind of God at the time he entered upon the construction of the present order of things. And from the workings of the machinery of nature, from the character of its laws, and the results of its action, we learn what he wills to be at the present, or any given period of time. For whatever developements may take place, whatever phenomena may be evolved by the workings of nature, we know that they are but an expression of God's mind, or of what he wills then and there to come to pass. Or, in other and more direct terms, we learn from these phenomena what God is doing at the particular point of time in question. And thus the universe, with all its laws and results, as a whole and in all its parts, is but the visible speech of God, the shadow of his infinite mind and will!

If, then, this position may be regarded as established, it will be allowed that it would not be correct to say that a miracle is a violation of a law of nature. For, if the laws of nature are only the mode or rule of God's operations, the plan according to which he works out his purposed ends; then to call a miracle a violation of a law of nature, is equivalent to saying it is a violation of the plan of God. In point of fact, there can be no such thing as a violation of a law of nature, for it has no laws but the rule or manner of God's action. If it can be shown that God has performed a certain act, or done a certain work, then the way, the particular manner, in which the work was done, constitutes the law of nature for that particular work or occasion. If there is any truth or force in the reasoning which has preceded, then this conclusion follows of necessity.

Let it, then, be established that a given event has taken place, that a miracle has been wrought, and it must be admitted that it is according to a law of nature, which is only the method in which God works. And the miracle itself is only the outward expression of the thought of God, the physical utterance of his will or purpose at that particular time in reference to the particular result involved. To say therefore, that a miracle is a violation of a law of nature, seems to be a false view of the character and meaning of a miracle, and of the true relation of the laws of nature to the mind of the Deity.

Digitized by Google

So also, to say that a miracle is impossible, because it is a violation of a law of nature, is assuming to know definitely all the methods in which God does work, or can work; all the ways and means in the universe, by which he may accomplish any given result, or reach any proposed end. This no one can do, unless he is omnipotent and omniscient, unless he has fathomed the depths of the infinite mind, and measured the extent of its resources and the field of its action. Until we have attained to this, we have no right, at least it is somewhat presumptuous, to affirm that a miracle is impossible in the nature of things; and that, therefore, every account of a miracle, wherever found, must of necessity be resolved into a myth or a falsehood. It is quite probable that God has not yet displayed all his power, nor revealed to us all his thoughts and purposes, and all his methods of action; and until he does, it will surely be becoming in us to maintain a reasonable degree of modesty in our assertion of what is impossible; or what is contrary to the laws of nature, which are only a mode of divine action.

But, when carefully examined, what is the real value of the expression, "violation of the laws of nature"? Well, when divested of all assumption, and reduced to simple matter of fact, it means no more than this: that a given event, or miracle, has never taken place within the circle of our experience; that during the few years we have lived, no such phenomena have been evolved by those laws of nature that lie within the extremely limited sphere of our knowledge and observation. This is all it can mean truly and legitimately; for we cannot affirm or deny, anything respecting the operations and results of the laws of nature, or what is the same thing, the acts of God, during the ages prior to our existence on the earth; or in the boundless regions lying outside the sphere of our present knowledge and examination.

One who had lived under the equator all his days, and knew nothing of nature or its operations in other latitudes or under other circumstances than those which surrounded him, when told that water sometimes became so hard and solid that men could walk upon it, would very likely say it was impossible, contrary to, or a violation of, the laws of nature. But this, in reality, would only prove that he had

Digitized by Google

never witnessed such a phenomenon, that he had never seen God display his power or will, through nature to the production of such a result. So when told that water, without being brought into the specific condition here alluded to, or in other words, while in a liquid state, could be made to bear, and had actually borne the weight of a man, so that he could walk upon it, as Jesus, for example; he might say again that it was impossible, and in violation of the established and invariable laws of nature. But in this case also the assertion would prove, not that it was impossible, or a violation of any law of nature, but only that he had not seen such a thing; that within the limits of his observation God had never so manifested his power or given expression to his will, through the elements of nature. This is the entire value of the assertion, and to extend its meaning beyond this is only assumption without proof.

The same remarks apply to other natural phenomena. One who should be told for the first time, that a shower of stones had fallen from the sky, would, without doubt, promptly deny the possibility of the thing, as in direct contravention of the established order of nature. So, if we were entirely ignorant of all the laws and effects of magnetism or electricity, and were told that a piece of iron had risen of itself from the earth, and, rushing upward, fastened itself to another piece of iron, or iron ore, and contrary to the action of its own weight, remained suspended in the air; we should at once affirm that such a thing could not be, that it was contrary to the universal law of gravitation, and that the witness had either stated a wilful falsehood, or was himself deceived. And if, under the same circumstances of ignorance, we were assured that in five or ten minutes a message had been conveyed to a distance of a thousand miles, we should without hesitation pronounce it an impossibility, and laugh the believer of such a story to scorn.

But as the case stands, it is clear that all our scoffing and denial, all our bold assumptions of the impossibility of such events, and of their violation of the laws of nature, would be reduced to the simple fact that we had never seen or known such events, and that we were not acquainted with any principles working in nature adequate to the

Digitized by Google

production of such phenomena. Or, in other words, meaning the same, we had never witnessed the power and purpose of God displaying itself in this particular way.

So again, if we should be told, that a small loaf of bread had been suddenly made to increase in size and substance sufficient to feed several thousands of men and women; or that certain men had suddenly begun to speak fluently in languages of which, up to that moment they were wholly ignorant; or that a man, actually dead, had been instantly raised to life again, — if these things should be stated to us as real occurrences, as historical facts, we might deny that they ever took place, and pronounce them absolute impossibilities; because contrary to, and in direct violation of, the fixed and unchanging laws of nature. And of the authors of such statements, we might add that, however honest they might be, they were grossly deceived and could not be believed. But in this, as in the other examples, our assertions of the impossibility of such events, when stripped of its verbiage and pretensions, amounts only to a confession of ignorance. It is simply saying we know of no law of nature, no method of divine action, or operation, tending to such results. No such events have fallen within the circle of our experience or knowledge. We have never seen God working through nature to such ends, to the producing the particular and special effects in question. This is all we say, or can say, strictly and logically. For to affirm that such results are really and absolutely impossibilities, is virtually to affirm that God cannot do these things, that his will is not able to express itself in this way. Few, perhaps, would be willing to take this position. To say that he can do such things, but that he never has done them, is only bald assertion without the least shadow of evidence in its support; and cannot be put in plea against the testimony of those who affirm that God has done these things, that he has expressed his thought and will in the ways named, and that they themselves saw and heard.

And here is a point in our inquiry, worthy of some thought. If the foregoing reasoning be allowed, then there is no argument or objection, *a priori*, against a miracle on the score of impossibility, or its opposition to the laws of nature. No valid reason, founded on the extraor-

Digitized by Google

dinary character of the events, can be offered in evidence to show that such events have not taken place, or could not take place. The question, then, as to their actual occurrence, is, after all, narrowed down to the single point of testimony, the credibility of the witnesses who solemly affirm that they have themselves seen these things.

Nor does it seem strictly in place to say that, the possibility of miracles admitted, their actual occurrence cannot be allowed, until it can be shown that the occasion, on which they are said to have occurred, was sufficient to justify, or call for, such action on the part of God, such an exhibition of his power and will. For this would be setting ourselves up as judges of what it would be fit and proper for God to do on particular occasions. It is virtually assuming to be acquainted with every possible conjunction of circumstances under which a miracle would be justifiable. Now it is quite possible that the necessity for a miracle might exist, and yet we not be able to discover it; or, if pointed out to us, to appreciate it. It is quite possible that God might see occasion for such action on his part, while the circumstances and influences which go to make up the occasion, might lie entirely beyond the orbit of our observation and comprehension.

While, therefore, a miracle has no inherent impossibility in its nature; and while it must be confessed that we are not competent judges of the necessities or occasions which may justify such exhibitions of the divine energy and will; we fall back again to the simple position, that the question of their actual occurrence must be determined by the character and credibility of the witnesses in the case.

And it is worthy of note, that extraordinary events, or those supposed to be in direct conflict with natural laws, have come at last to be believed solely on the ground of testimony. The strength of the evidence has gradually overcome our belief of their repugnance to nature, notwithstanding the affirmation that testimony is variable and nature invariable. The fact that water sometimes becomes hard enough to walk upon; the falling of stones from the skies; a piece of iron rising from the earth of itself; the sending a message and its answer a thousand miles in a few minutes; the passage of a vessel without sails or oars,

Digitized by Google

against wind and tide twenty miles an hour; these things have been believed by the mass of mankind wholly on testimony, and that too against the conviction of their seeming impossibility and opposition to the laws of nature. The discovery that they were consonant to nature, and possible, did not precede the belief of them, and cause them to be received on testimony. But they were first received on testimony, and this as a cause, operated to the conclusion that, in some way, they were brought about according to natural laws. Even now we know nothing of the origin of falling stones; nor do we know anything of the real essence of magnetism, or how, or why, it produces the wonderful phenomena in question; yet we implicitly believe in the reality of the phenomena — most of us on the testimony of others.

We return, now, to the position, that a miracle is conformable to the laws of nature, which are the method in which God expresses his will, or works out his purpose. It will be said, then, if these events are according to natural laws, then they are not miracles, are of no force or value as credentials of divine authority, because any one knowing these laws may work them. But this depends entirely on the meaning we attach to the word miracle. It is necessary, therefore, that we should determine the exact value of this term; and know, when it is employed, the precise and definite thought represented by it. Setting aside then, all merely metaphysical niceties, we mean by a miracle, a special work wrought for or through man, by superhuman means, or by the power of God. It must not be an ordinary or usual occurrence, because the very purpose for which it is wrought, implies that it is special. And the superhuman element is not of itself enough to make good the definition; for the revolution of the earth on its axis, the power of a steam engine, or an earthquake, is superhuman, but not miraculous in the sense implied. The work must, therefore, be special, occasional, and wrought for man, or through him as an instrument; and by means which are beyond or above the ability of man.

As an example to the point, we will take the raising of the dead. It will be allowed, I suppose, on all hands, that an occurrence of this sort would answer to the above definition. Indeed the denial that such an event ever took

Digitized by Google

place, on the ground of its impossibility, and its violation of the laws of nature, implies this admission on the part of those who make such denial. For if such a thing were within the power or capability of man, then there would be no propriety or force in the denial of the New Testament record of such occurrences, on the alleged grounds, viz., their impossibility, or opposition to the regular and established order of nature. The raising of the dead, then, will be allowed to be a miracle in the sense of the definition given.

To this definition of a miracle, however, it will probably be objected, in the outset, that this special action on the part of God, is virtually confession of an after-thought with him. It will be said, that it implies that certain circumstances have come about, certain exigencies have arisen unexpectedly, which cannot be met in the usual way, by the ordinary operations of his government; and that, therefore, the original arrangements being defective, a special provision or action must be introduced to meet the difficulty, and answer the want.

For the better conclusion of the argument, we think it well to consider this supposed objection here. We reply, then, that no such inference is implied in the statement. It is of course admitted, and affirmed, that the particular circumstances in question, or exigencies, so called, were foreseen in the beginning by God; and that they were provided for in the very way herein set forth; namely, by that specific kind of action called miracle. No new thought or plan of action, is supposed to have arisen in the mind of God. At a particular period of time, a particular or special effect, intended in the original arrangement of things, is to be brought about. When that time arrives, a new antecedent or cause is introduced in that particular direction, namely, the operative will of God; and the desired effect follows, the dead are raised to life.

Let us illustrate this by reference to the watch, as an example. The object of this instrument chiefly is to measure time. This is the purpose of its construction. But on examination we find conected with it, an alarm apparatus, the object of which is to awaken its possessor at a given hour of the night or morning. Now, as remarked, the main design of the watch is to measure time; but here is also a special

Digitized by Google

arrangement introduced into its original structure, to meet a special want foreseen by the maker. It operates, of course, in harmony with the structure of the watch, and according to its laws; but the particular time when it shall operate, and the power that sets it in motion, are entirely independent of the machinery and its laws, and lie in the will of the owner.

Let us take another example. Entering a cotton mill, and examining the machinery, we discover the purpose of it; we behold a physical expression of the design and will of the inventor; which is the production of cloth. But on looking round we discover also an arrangement, by drums and bands, for producing, at particular times, a special result, to wit, the revolution of a filing apparatus, or a turning lathe. This was provided for in building the machinery, and when in motion, is carried by the same power, obedient to the same laws. But the application of the power at any given moment, is outside of the machinery and its laws, and is the effect of another cause, viz., the direct action of man; and, without this cause, the machinery might run forever, if it would last so long, without the special result in question being obtained. And observe that this special action does not conflict with any of the laws of the general machinery, or of the motive power. It is simply a new antecedent, followed by a new consequent; a particular direction of power to a specific end which, when the occasion has passed, ceases; while the general causes and laws prevail, and the rest of the machinery goes on, uninterrupted, as before.

So in the case in question. It is granted that, as a general law, when men die they remain dead — or, in other words, that, under ordinary circumstances, the dead are not raised to life again on this earth. When, therefore, this takes place, it is the effect of a special cause, viz., the will of God acting in that particular direction, at that particular time, to the production of that precise result. The old causes, so to speak, operate as before, without interruption. The dead generally do not rise in the alleged way. But under the new set of circumstances induced by the new cause, particular dead do rise, as was intended by God, and provided for in the beginning.

Having now disposed of the objection grounded on the

Digitized by Google

specialty of a miracle, we return to the definition; that a miracle, though according to the laws of nature, is, nevertheless, wrought by superhuman power, or by the power of God, and is a work peculiar to him, whatever the agency or instrument by which it is performed. There is no force, therefore, in the assertion, that if miracles are wrought according to natural laws, they are not credentials of divine authority, inasmuch as any one who shall become acquainted with these laws may do the work. Nor can it be allowed as philosophical or logical, that the race in the progress of ages will become sufficiently developed to work miracles, by force of their knowledge of the supposed powers of nature, and of the relations of spirit to matter. This conclusion does not follow from the premises; and can only be adopted by those who, in their reasoning, confound the idea of power with the idea of method.

The laws of nature, as we have seen, are only the method in which the will of God acts to its purposed ends. It does not follow that a knowledge of these laws, or this method imparts power also. I may know the manner, or the law, according to which God works: but it would be very hasty to conclude that I can therefore do the work which God does. Knowledge in this case is not power. For example; it may be granted that the raising of the dead is, in method, perfectly accordant with all the laws of spirit and body, and conformable to the established principles of their organic association, and the elements of physical life; and I may attain to a clear understanding of the process by which the spirit is reunited to the body — but with all this, the power to do the great work may be infinitely beyond my reach. Nothing is more obvious than the fact, that the knowledge of the manner in which the dead are raised, does not involve the power to raise the dead. The last is quite distinct from the first.

Again; I may by diligent study come to a knowledge of the law of attraction, by which the moon affects the rise and fall of the tides; but I cannot for this control the rise and fall of the tides, or adjust the moon's place so as to produce the results in question. So I may understand the process or law by which the elements might be restrain-

Digitized by Google

ed, and a tempest suddenly reduced to a calm; but yet this knowledge might not be one step towards the possession of the power necessary to produce the desired equilibrium in the atmosphere — the power which could say to the winds and waves, "peace, be still;" and be obeyed.

It is important in our inquiry that a proper distinction should be had in respect to the principles involved. We should avoid all confusion both of ideas and words. A law of nature, as we have seen, is only the method in which certain results are brought about. The power which works out these results is quite distinct and independent of the law or method. And even if it be allowed, that the race of man may progress so far in future ages, as to become acquainted with all the laws according to which miracles are wrought; still they may be just as far from the power to work them, as they are at the present moment.

If, now, the ground of the argument is changed, and the power to work miracles is predicated, not of the mere knowledge of the laws of nature, but of the moral and physical perfection of man; still the position seems equally without proof. So far as the severity of argument goes, it remains to be shown that there is any logical or natural connection between a perfect physical and moral organization, and the power to work miracles. Unless this can be established by satisfactory evidence, the bare supposition, or assertion, that it may be so, cannot be received as decisive of the question.

It may reasonably be doubted whether any degree of physical or spiritual developement to which man can attain, is necessarily followed, as a consequence, by miraculous power; by an ability, or energy to control the elements, or raise the dead. So far as there are any facts that may be legitimately employed in such an inquiry, nothing appears to indicate that those remarkable in this respect have made any approaches to the use or possession of such power. The lives of Howard, Fenelon, Oberlin, and others who walked near to God, present no examples of the presence of this divine energy; no consciousness on their part of the smallest beginnings of such power resident in them.

But if the views of the source and nature of miracles

Digitized by Google

presented in the preceding inquiry be correct, then there is no reason to expect such power on the part of man, as the product of a perfectly developed human nature. Miracles are the prerogative of God; and his omnipotent will is the only power adequate to their production. Man, so to speak, is but the instrument on whom, or through whom, the work is wrought out. Of himself he can do nothing. The infinite Mind worketh in him to will and to do; giving, withdrawing, or withholding the power, at pleasure, according to his plan and purpose. There can be no such thing, therefore, as man being developed in any, or all his faculties united, up to the point of miraculous power; no such thing as the race ever progressing to an equality with God in this respect. Whosoever, therefore, is endowed with the power of miracles, gives, it would seem, conclusive proof that he is a chosen instrument of Heaven; that God is with him, and works in and through him the fulfilment of his purposes, whether known or unknown to us. His works are witnesses of his divine authority and commission, on the simple ground that no man could do these works if God were not with him, acting in him and by him. Miracles, therefore, are credentials of a commission from God; and unquestionably whosoever presents these credentials, justly calls upon us to believe in him, and receive him as the special messenger of the Father.

A single point remains to be touched. If the foregoing argument presents the true philosophy of miracles, then if Christ is sent of God, we may reasonably expect that the ground which he takes in reference to his miracles, will not only conform to it, but will go directly to confirm its truth and correctness. This, on examination, will be found to be the case. It seems beyond question, that those who allow the purity and integrity of Jesus Christ, and his knowledge of the source of his power, must confess that the leading position of this communication, and the point just presented are abundantly illustrated and established by his words and conduct. He makes no pretensions to any power of his own, inherent in him, as the necessary product of the regular and progressive developement of his nature. He does not claim to do his works through force of his purity of his moral and spiritual perfection. He does not seem conscious of any miraculous energy, or extraordinary abil-

Digitized by Google

ity, springing from this source independently of all influence without or beyond himself.

So far from this, so far from claiming to work his miracles on any such ground, from any power inherent in himself; he distinctly and repeatedly disavows the idea, and refers all his power and his works directly to God, as the operative agent. There is scarcely a point in his whole life on which he is more explicit than on this. The citation of a few declarations to this effect, will abundantly justify the statement, and exhibit the true relation of Christ to his miracles, and the true relation of himself and his miracles to God.

"I can of mine own self do nothing." (John v.) Is not this a strange declaration if he felt the miracle his own? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soevever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth; and he will show him greater works than these" (Ver. 19, 20.) "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works," (John xiv.) In these passages Christ declares in the most emphatic and unqualified manner, that he does not work of himself, or by his own power, but by the given power of God, who dwelleth in him. Nay, he goes so far as to say that it is not himself at all, but the Father that doeth the works in or through him. This is the fact we have endeavored to elucidate; that the miracle is not of the man, but of the will and infinite energy of God, who is the real author of the work; and that, therefore, no mere developement of the powers and faculties of man, no human, moral or spiritual perfection, involves the power of performing such a work.

The same idea set forth in the language quoted, is expressed by Jesus on other occasions in less direct terms. And he affirms the same fact in regard to his revelations of divine truth; referring everything to the Father. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor," &c. (Luke iv.) "If I cast out devils by the spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." (Matt. xii.) "I came down

Digitized by Google

from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." (John vi.) "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me, he gave me commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. . . Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." (John xii.) "I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me." (Chap. xvii.) "The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me." (xiv.) "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me." "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things. . . . . Ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God." (viii.) "Many good works have I showed you from my Father." (x.)

Now, it cannot well be supposed that Christ would, so often, make such direct and unqualified assertions, that neither his words, nor works, neither his revelations of divine truth, nor his miracles, were his own; if he had felt or believed that they were result of his own superior knowledge of the laws of nature, or the natural product of his own powers and faculties, highly or perfectly devoloped; or the effect of any spiritual force having its source in himself. It can scarcely be believed that he would so positively and repeatedly have ascribed his knowledge of the Father's will and purpose, and his miracles, directly to that Father, if he had been conscious all the while that they were only the flower and fruit of a perfect physical and moral organization, of a high degree of spiritual purity, of a powerful human will. It is manifest that Christ regarded himself as only the instrument through which God communicated the truths in question, and wrought the miracles. Hence his unequivocal denial of any inherent power of his own sufficient for the production of the results which were brought about. Hence his positive asseveration, "The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."

It appears too, that the disciples of Christ, and others, fully understood him in this respect; for they distinctly affirm the same thing, that his miracles are wrought by God, or by the power given of God. They do not think of ascribing them to any physical or spiritual perfection of Christ, or to any natural force of his own. "God anointed

Digitized by Google

Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power." (Acts x.) "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him." (Acts ii.) And his resurrection is also referred to the power of God. "Whom God has raised from the dead." (Acts iii.) "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." (ii.) These declarations show very clearly the views of the disciples respecting the source of Christ's power and wisdom; and it is evident that they had no thought of these being his own, the product of spiritual energy inherent in him. They ascribe all to God; and, as Christ had done, affirm directly that "God did" the works himself.

If we follow the inquiry in reference to the disciples themselves, we find the same principle involved, and the same acknowledgements made. There seems no good reason for believing that these men, who, previous to their call to follow Christ, were not distinguished for any extraordinary powers, were more developed physically, intellectually, or spiritually, than any others in the same walks of life. And they do not pretend to any such thing; nor after their call do they claim any miraculous energy of their own.

The Saviour had told them that whatever ability they possessed in this respect, would be given them of God. "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence. Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you." (Acts. i.) "I send you the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city until ye be endued with power from on high." (Luke xxiv.) "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." (John xiv.) "It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father, which speaketh in you." (Matt. x.)

In perfect accordance with this declaration of Jesus, we find the disciples referring their miracles, not to their knowledge of natural forces, or to their own moral power; but to God, either directly, or through Christ. When the lame man was healed, Peter says to the wondering multitude, "Why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so ear-

Digitized by Google

nestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk? The God of Abraham," &c. (Acts iii.) Here is a positive denial that the healing was done by any power of their own, or through force of any holiness, or moral and spiritual development of their own; and it is ascribed directly to the will or energy of God, manifested through Christ. "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul." (Acts xix.) "Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." (xv.) "There are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. . . . To one is given by the spirit the word of wisdom. . . . To another gifts of healing, to another the working of miracles: but all these worketh that one and the self-same spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." (1 Cor. xii.) "God also bearing witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost according to his own will." (Heb. ii.) "And now, Lord, grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word, by stretching forth thine hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus." (Acts. iv.)

These passages point very clearly to the fact, that the disciples did not regard the power of working miracles as resident in themselves; and hence the prayer that God would stretch forth his hand to heal, and grant unto them the witness, through these works, that he was with them. And it is written in the closing portion of Mark's Gospel —"And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." They never think of claiming these works as the natural results of their own spiritual developement; the effect of physical and moral force in themselves. God was the author. They were the instrument. He wrought by their hands, or through them. He gave them "gifts of the Holy Spirit according to his own will." All flowed from his infinite will and energy; and however diversified the operations or miracles, it is "the same God that worketh all in all."

As we have said, this is the proposition with which we

Digitized by Google

started, and which we have endeavored throughout to illustrate and establish as the true philosophy of miracles. And, in conclusion, if the inquiry has been properly conducted, the following results are obtained:

The laws of nature are only the method in which God acts, or gives outward expression to his thought and will.

A miracle, then, is not a violation of the laws of nature, which, as said, is but a mode of divine action; and, therefore, on this ground, no exception can be taken to the possibility of a miracle.

But a miracle, though according to natural laws, is the product of a superhuman power; a special work of God, directed to a special end. He, therefore, through or by whom the miracle is wrought, furnishes proof that God is with him in a special manner.

This special working, however, on the part of God, does not imply any defect in his original plan of conducting the affairs of the universe; for this working, or the miracle, was intended and provided for, and made a part of that plan from the beginning.

A miracle, then, being the direct result of the operative will of God, there can be no such thing as the human race progressing to a degree of goodness and purity, to a knowledge of the laws and forces of nature, or to a perfection of physical and moral organization, that, as a cause, will be necessarily followed by the ability to work miracles, as an effect. Or, in other words, there can be no such thing as man being spiritually developed up to the point of miraculous power. This is the prerogative of God alone; a power residing exclusively in him.

This view of the source and nature of miracles is confirmed by Christ, who in the most unreserved and emphatic manner, disclaims all power in this respect, as inherent in himself; and ascribes his miracles directly to God, who works in him and through him. His disciples affirm the same thing of him, and of themselves; declaring that God wrought the miracles by them; and that without him they were nothing and could do nothing. T. B. T.

Digitized by Google

Art. X.

The Christian Doctrine of the Atonement.

Save in one instance, the word atonement is not to be found in the New Testament. But the idea it should express, the reconciliation of man to God, is a leading peculiarity of the Gospel, allusions to which crowd nearly every page of the Christian record. The subject of the atonement has been much discussed in all ages of the church. Heathen dogmas, scholastic subtleties, one-sided investigations, passionate party zeal, and bloody persecution, have, each in its turn, contributed to pervert it, to obscure it, to exaggerate it, to mar it, and to hand it down as an intellectual heirloom of perpetual disagreement. A large portion of the community entertain wholly erroneous conceptions of its real nature and import. A still larger portion have no clear views about it either one way or another. Now in all things the truth is to be coveted above everything else. It is moreover hard to over-estimate the value of a clear and well-defined knowledge of any subject which we deem worthy of attention. It certainly will not be thought a trivial thing, of no practical importance, whether we have no fixed belief at all, whether we monstrously distort, or whether we truly understand, one of the chief doctrines of the religion we profess to receive and to follow. Let us see, then, if we cannot, to our full satisfaction, discover the amount of genuine christian truth underlying the mass of error which passes current as the doctrine of the cross, the atoning sacrifice of Christ. The character of God, the justice of his government, and the dispersion of our doubtful perplexities, alike, require that the truth should be known.

The various words and phrases used by the christian

Digitized by Google

writers in connection with the doctrine of the atonement made by our Saviour, were borrowed from the phraseology of the Mosaic law. In order, therefore, to appreciate their significant force in this secondary use, we must first know what they orignally meant. We go then to their primitive applications in the books of Moses and in the writings of the prophets.

A glance through the Old Testament will frequently find in close connection, the words sin and atonement, uncleanness and purification. A thorough examination of all such passages will establish the following results.

I. Throughout the Jewish scriptures there is not a single text having the slightest appearance of teaching anything like substitution of punishment, or vicarious suffering, the punishment of the innocent instead of the guilty. The general burden of declaration is, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," not another in its stead.

II. It is not once hinted, even in the remotest manner, that God is either unable, or unwilling, to forgive the offender freely upon his repentance. On the contrary, the Bible is thronged with declarations of a directly and most positively opposite character. Statements like this are everywhere to be met — "If the wicked will turn from his evil and do right, he shall surely live, and his transgressions shall not be mentioned."

III. The purpose of sacrifices among the Jews was twofold. First, they were intended as memorials of God's favors to their nation, and as expressions of gratitude to him. For instance, the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb was an annual emblem of thanksgiving to God, that when the Angel of Death smote the first born of all the families of Egypt, he passed by every door of the children of Israel, sparing to strike. Secondly, they were used for ritual purification in accordance with the requirements of the ceremonial law. That there was nothing vicarious in these sacrifices, that is, that they implied no transference of punishment from the sinful to the innocent, is demonstrated bebeyond the power of cavil, by the fact that the former kind were a simple return of thanks to God in remembrance of his benefits; and that the latter kind were offered for the purification of places and things as well as for the purification of men. No sacrifice is ever represented as vicarious, no

Digitized by Google

substitution of a righteous person for a sinner is ever spoken of. He who reads the Old Testament, without prejudice and carefully, will not find a single instance of vicarious atonement, a single instance in which the punishment of sin and the wrath of God are diverted from the guilty offender to the unoffending beast, whose blood streamed upon the altar. But on the contrary, he will find every sacrifice to be offered, either as "the savor of a sweet smell" in token of gratitude and submission to the Almighty, or else as the outward ceremonies of worship commanded and regulated by the Mosaic ritual.

IV. In the Jewish theocracy, or direct government of God over their nation as they understood it, there was a spiritual law having its dominion in the hearts of men to govern the spirit of their lives, as well as a ceremonial law, placed in the guardianship of their priesthood, to determine the formal observances of their religion. The former was the universal and everlasting rule of right, the will of God, whose oracle is man's conscience. The latter was the national and temporal sacred rites expedient for a rude people in the first stages of their progress, to be cast off as they acquired spirituality. Christianity abrogated this; not by destroying, but by fulfilling and passing beyond it.

Sincere repentance seems to have held the same relation in restoring one to the forfeited privileges and rewards of the spiritual law, that sacrifices did in restoring one to those of the ceremonial law. Numberless instances might be adduced to show that God always freely forgave the truly penitent their sins, freely pardoned them, without demanding, in their stead, some innocent object on whose head he might pour his vengeance. The only condition stipulated for God's forgiveness of sin by the spiritual law —the same law that we live under now — was sincere repentance. Atonement, and everything connected with it, was confined to the ceremonial law. Its object was, not to influence God in any way, but to effect purification in the offender, by removing legal uncleanness. The condition of reconciliation in the ritual law after violations of its ordinances, was the offering of a sacrifice, and this condition was always insisted upon even when the offences were unconciously committed.

Now, we think, the whole matter, briefly stated, will

Digitized by Google

be sufficiently clear. The death of Christ had precisely the same purpose in relation to the spiritual law, that sacrifice had in relation to the ritual. When a Jew had broken the ceremonial code by any uncleanness, sacrifice, by fulfilling the condition of reconciliation, restored his external purity and enabled him to receive the benefits resulting from obedience to the ritual law. When men had broken the spiritual law by perverting their hearts and lives from the way of the Lord, Christ lived, taught, and died a sacrifice on account of sin, that he might induce them to repent and reform; that thus bringing themselves into harmony with duty, they might receive the blessings which flow from fulfilment of God's will. As in the former case there is nothing vicarious, so neither is there in the latter. The condition in that, was appropriate sacrifice; the condition in this, is heartfelt repentance. When John the Baptist, and when Jesus himself cried in desert and village, on sea and shore, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," the only condition was "repent!" In neither case, neither in the sacrifice of burnt offerings, nor in the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, was there any purpose of influencing and affecting a change in the unchangeable Jehovah; the aim was to influence and effect a change in man, fickle and rebellious man. The entire subject may be fairly stated thus. A Hebrew violated some command of the ritual law; the object of sacrifice was to restore the offender by making him atone with his national code. Men violated the everlasting truth; the object of Christ's mission was to restore the fallen sinners, by making them atone with God. The analogy here is plain and forcible, and we should naturally expect that Jewish converts to christianity, especially when writing to other Jews for the purpose of converting them, would industriously trace it out and set it, with all its bearings, in the most vivid light. Accordingly we find the sacrificial language of the Old Testament frequently applied to Christ in the New Testament. But that these terms have no peculiar sense, no vicarious signification, when applied to the Saviour, that they bear on the contrary a plain common-sense meaning, is shown by the fact that such is indisputably the case in the instances and usages from which alone the analogies are drawn. It is also shown by the fact that this language is by no means

Digitized by Google

confined to Christ. For example, notice the following texts: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice." "If I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all." "I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." "Let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually." "But to do good and to communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." It is clear that these passages bear no vicarious signification. The reason of so frequent application of sacrificial expressions to Christ was, no doubt, the peculiarly strong attachment of the Jews to their national law with its sacred observances, and its time-hallowed associations of patriotism and piety. This is shown by the fact that these allusions are used logically, for argument, as well as rhetorically, for illustration. To adduce a single instance of this: It is argued in one place, to the Jews, that they ought to receive Christianity instead of Judaism because it is the fulfilment of Judaism, a better developement of religion for which Judaism prepared the way. This the writer goes on to prove, by showing that under the law, sacrifices were formal, for ritual purposes, and often repeated; but that under the new dispensation, once for all, Christ was a moral sacrifice for spiritual purposes. Independently of this, however, and supposing the New Testament writings to have been addressed exclusively to Gentiles, the peculiar appropriateness of such words as sacrifice to the crucified Redeemer would probably have suggested and authorized their usage, though they would then have been used much more sparingly and have had much less formal importance attached to them.

In consequence of the erroneous conceptions of doctrine, the false interpretations of Scripture, the confused ideas and the numerous unjust associations which ignorance and prejudice have gathered about it, it will perhaps be necessary for us to note, particularly, the meaning of the principal words and texts involved in the controversy concerning the atonement.

Our Saviour's death is represented as a "ransom." The noun ransom corresponds to the verb redeem. Now, the Scriptures say, Christ suffered that he might "redeem

Digitized by Google

men from all their iniquities." This explains the meaning of ransom; not that he purchased the lost souls of men from the devil, from endless perdition, into the hands of God again, but that he ransomed them from their wicked ways, from the bondage of sin and guilt.

The death of Jesus is also called a "sacrifice;" to which no other interpretation than one of these two can be given, without perversely torturing the plainest words: First, the injustice and wickedness of men crucified Christ. In this sense he become a sacrifice to sin. Second, he died in order that the moral influences of his death and resurrection upon the hearts of men might lead them to godly repentance, and thus remove their sins. And in this sense he was a sacrifice for sin, or on account of sin. Certainly no reference is here made to appeasing in any way a vindictive anger of the Father.

Again, Christ is spoken of as a "propitiation." The word thus inadequately translated, means "a mercy-seat," and figuratively expresses the idea that Jesus is an emblem and pledge of divine mercy; not that he conciliates God's mercy towards us, but that he reveals to us God's eternal and unalterable love, thus influencing us to seek that forgiveness and favor ever waiting to bless us.

In connection with the purpose of Christ's mission, we find in one place, the word "atonement," which simply means, as it is rendered in every other passage where it occurs, "reconciliation;" and we are said to be reconciled to God by the death of his Son; but to suppose this reconciliation to be effected by any change in the disposition of God, or by any other means than the moral influences exerted upon men, is philosophically absurd, and scripturally false. Paul says, "as we are reconciled to God by the death of Christ, so much more shall we be saved by his life." The meaning is clearly this: As the moral influence of Christ's death softens our hearts, causes us to turn affectionately to God, and thus reconciles us to him; so, the moral influence of his life causes us to imitate his example, brings us into harmony with the spiritual law, and thus saves us from evil.

When the Scriptures say that Jesus came "to bear the sins of many;" when they say, "and himself bare our sins on the tree," they do not mean that he bare the guilt

Digitized by Google

of our sins, and suffered the punishment due to us; but that he caused us to leave our sins. In this sense he bare away our sins, removed them from us; just as when it is written, "himself bore our infirmities and carried our sorrows," the idea conveyed is that he bore away the infirmities, carried off the sorrows, and healed the diseases, and removed the sins of men — not took them and suffered them himself.

The phrase, "he was made a curse for us," is explained by the addition of the remainder of the verse, "for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." It simply means, he died the death of a malefactor, he was held as one accursed on account of our sins; not considered so by God, who judges righteous judgment according to the reality, but treated so by wicked men, his enemies, who judged falsely after the appearance. Who can believe that while Jesus, that spotless being in whom was found no guile, was undergoing the natural torture of crucifixion, when he turned up his face to God in filial love, and divinely prayed for forgiveness on his foes; when with touching confidence he commended his spirit into his Father's hands — who can believe that then, that Father sternly frowned with utter wrath upon his submissive Son, with mailed hand relentlessly tore away his interceding innocence, crushed him with the insufferable burden of a world's guilt, and, condensing into one awful pang all the infinite agony of hell, with it transfixed him upon the cross? — We say, who can believe this? Who does not shudder at the bare thought of such barbarous and unmitigated wrong? Why, if such conduct were attributed to any other being than God, nobody would credit it, it is so bad. And if such a doctrine were broached in any other subject than religion, men would shrink from it with one assent, and condemn it with one voice. But in the subject of religion, the grosser the contradiction, the more egregious the absurdity; the more horrible the principle, the more likely it is to be true and the more merit there is in accepting it! At least, so it would seem from many of the dogmas which have become prevalent. The New Testament always represents God as the author of the atonement, Christ as the agent, men as the subject, and holiness, or harmony with the spiritual law, as the object of it. A few

Digitized by Google

texts will set this in a strong light: "The ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." God, "having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you by turning away every one of you from his iniquities." "Christ hath once suffered for sins, that he might bring us to God." Not a passage can be found which speaks of Christ's death as a punishment from God inflicted on him as a substitute for the wicked. His death is uniformly represented as a part of his mission, and not to be separated from the rest of it; as a part of the system of moral influences which were to regenerate the world; as his voluntary act; as the completion and summing up of his life; as a prelude to his resurrection, and as the fulfilment of prophecy. "I lay down my life that I may take it again," said he. And when it is written, as it often is, that "Christ died for us," the meaning must evidently be, that he died, not in our stead, but, as it says, *for* us, for our benefit. There are two reasons especially for regarding that as the sense of such passages. First, that it is the only fair and natural interpretation of the language. Second, that it is perfectly consistent, while the opposite is wholly inconsistent, both with justice and mercy, upon the principles either of human reason or of Christian morality.

There are two doctrines of the atonement considerably prevalent. The conclusions to which the present investigation leads may be briefly embodied in two propositions, with the proofs of each. The true view of the atonement in Christianity is this: Men by their wickedness were alienated from God. In ignorance and guilt they rebelled against him and broke his laws, and were therefore exposed to continual punishment. Then God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son to save it. And Jesus came into the world to save sinners by causing them to repent and reform, and thus be reconciled to God and obtain eternal life. To effect this change in the dispositions of men, was the object of the self-sacrificing mission of "Christ and him crucified." This is the true doctrine of the atonement, because such is the evidently correct interpretation of the languge in which the New Testament unfolds the subject; and moreover, because it is entirely consonant with sound reason and with all the attributes of God. The vicarious

Digitized by Google

doctrine is the erroneous view of the atonement. It may be stated concisely as follows: God was alienated from men by their sin. His indignation burned against them. Furthermore, he could not pardon them their transgressions even if he would. Then, in order to satisfy his own will, in order to reconcile himself to men, and in order that he might forgive their iniquities, he took upon himself the form of a man, came into the world, endured at the hands of men every indignity and stripe they could inflict; and then, fusing into one excruciating moment of agony all the pain which millions of guilty wretches ought to suffer, poured its scalding anguish upon his own defenceless head. Then justice was satisfied; his anger appeased, he became reconciled to men, and could freely forgive all who believed. According to this scheme, Christ, who kept every commandment, suffered the consequences of all violated law, instead of the sinners; he suffered as a substitute for them in order that the Father might be at one with them, and receive them with love, letting them go free of their just deserts, because he had endured pain which he did not deserve! We believe this view of the atonement to be false, for the following reasons. First, it was not received by the primitive Christians, but gradually came to light and obtained acceptance from misinterpretation of Scripture, through its admixture with the wild imaginations of heathen philosophy and the speculative dogmas of heretics in the early church, and during the "dark ages." Second; it destroys the possibility of any such thing as forgiveness, which is a cardinal doctrine of Christianity. If the Gospel has one peculiar and chief glory, it is that it reveals God's willingness to pardon freely every sinner who sincerely repents and turns to him. But the supposition of a full vicarious atonement renders this utterly impossible. For, upon that theory, the act which God performs is not forgiveness; no, but transferrence of punishment from one object to another. And besides, if it did not totally ignore forgiveness, who would be willing to accept forgiveness upon such terms? Who that has the feelings of a man, would consent, after he had committed a sin, to escape by leaving an innocent person to suffer the consequences of the crime? Third; it is the very height of injustice; for what is injustice if it be not the withhold-

Digitized by Google

ng of something deserved, or the infliction of something undeserved; both of which acts, in their extremest evil, are involved in the view of the vicarious atonement. If this doctrine were true, before its monstrous front of wrong, all the other sins the world has ever known, if accumulated into one fearful mass, would dwindle into nothing in the comparison! If it were true, the awful injustice of the cross would tower up from Mount Calvary in a pillar of guilt whose shadow would darken the universe, and sully the countenance of God! The unchanging rule of Providence is equal and exact justice; and therefore no such tragedy as this could be played in the face of high heaven to make the angels weep. It would be well for those who say it could, to learn a lesson about blasphemy from that old prophet of God, who indignantly demanded, "Shall not the Judge of the whole earth do right?" Fourth; it is useless and impossible. Imagine one person of the Trinity to atone to the other, God to atone to himself for the sins of men, in order that they may be forgiven. Suppose the atonement effected, and what is the difference? What change is there? There are the men, their crimes, their guilt, their merits, just as they were before, unchanged. Why could not the Almighty have pardoned them just as well before the atonement as after? The reader will excuse a very homely illustration because it is a very true one. The case is simply thus: One man owes another a thousand guineas. He cannot pay it, and therefore goes to his creditor and says, "I am destitute; I cannot pay you; I am at your mercy; forgive me my debt." The creditor replies, "I cannot forgive you now; it is out of my power; wait a moment, however." He then gravely proceeds to his own drawer, deliberately takes out a thousand guineas, and replaces them again as they were. Then he says to his debtor, "I could not forgive you your debt before, but it is fully paid now; now I forgive you freely; you may go; I am satisfied; you owe me nothing now." Do you wonder why he could not just as well remit the debt without disturbing his own guineas, as he could after that was done? So we wonder why the Lord could not just as well forgive man's trespasses without assuming their punishment upon himself, as he could afterwards. If it be said that God did not make the atonement to him-

Digitized by Google

self, but to the inexorable law which had been broken; we reply that the law was a dead, unconscious thing, which knew nothing and required nothing of itself; the only law was the will of the living God; and still more the law was not that for a certain amount of sin there should be a certain amount of suffering somewhere in the universe; but the law was, and is, and ever will be, "the soul that sinneth, it shall" suffer the penalty. Vicarious atonement, consequently, is not only futile, but actually absurd.

Surely there are three practical inferences which we should all draw from the consideration of the atonement, and carry away in our hearts. First, it is our duty to be grateful to God that he never needs to be reconciled to us, only we to him; that he always loves us and delights to do us benefits; that in all our wanderings, in all our iniquities, he still yearns towards us, and hastens to meet us while we are yet a great way off; that when we were very alien from him, he sent Jesus to manifest his love, and to lead us back to the bosom of his tenderness. Let us recognise his goodness, let us be thankful unto him, and, by wisely living, try to please him.

Second, we ought, with much love, to remember the Lord Jesus, how he gave himself for us that he might bring us to the truth. We should be sincerely grateful to him, and to his Father for his sake, on account of his self-sacrifice for us, and on account of the great good he has conferred upon us. Let us cherish his spirit, imitate his virtues, and labor for his cause. For this is the best gratitude, and most acceptable to heaven.

Third, as a motive to watchfulness, as a strong safeguard in time of tempting trial, let us never forget our individual responsibility for sin. Let the irreversible law which penetrates every living atom and swathes creation in adamantine bands — that which sins shall suffer—let this dread law be written over the door of every conscience, that no thought may enter without reading it, and no desire go forth without seeing it. Oh man, whoever thou art, never forget that if the clutch of guilt be once fastened on thy soul, thou canst no more unloose it "till the uttermost farthing be paid," than thou canst unclench the fatal fingers of destiny. You cannot shift the burden of crime, and of crime's terrible woe, upon another. It is upon you and

Digitized by Google

you must bear it. Take the wings of morning and flee to the frozen mountains of the north, to the sunny plains of the south, to the burning deserts of the central earth, you cannot escape from yourself, and "your sins will find you out," and remorse will thrust the red scroll of guilt before your eyes, and fearful thoughts will fly to and fro, in your soul, crying, "woe, woe to the transgressor," and in every spot of the globe where you pause, peace will avoid you—

> "For there 's no sequestered grot,
> Lone mountain tarn or isle forgot,
> But Justice, journeying in the sphere,
> Daily stoops to harbor there."

W. R. A.

Art. XI.

Bushnell on Christian Nurture.

Views of Christian Nurture, and of Subjects adjacent thereto, by Horace Bushnell. Hartford: 1847. pp. 251, 12mo.

The contents of this volume are, two "Discourses on Christian Nurture," an "Argument" for the discourses; an article on the "Spiritual Economy of Revivals of Religion;" an article also entitled "Growth, not Conquest, the true Method of Christian Progress;" and two sermons, one on the "Organic Unity of the Family," and the other entitled "The scene of the Pentecost, and a Christian Parish." To all this, is appended a long "Note," for the two-fold purpose of justifying certain remarks in the "Argument," reflecting somewhat severely upon a certain professor in a theological seminary in his neighborhood, and upon the condition of the school, and the use made of its members and its influence; and as a reply to a letter from that worthy incumbent himself. We may here

Digitized by Google

remark once for all, that this "Note" opens a scene of intermeddling, narrow-mindedness, and espionage in relation to Dr. Bushnell, his sentiments and doings, as little for his comfort, as for the credit of those engaged in it. So much with respect to this "Note" and those to whom it more especially alludes.

The circumstances that occasioned this publication in its present form, make rather an interesting item in ecclesiastical history, though not very creditable to that portion of the Orthodox Congregationalists of New England, sometimes called the Old School. It seems that Dr. Bushnell was suspected of some unsoundness in his doctrine of the natural state of man, and the method of regeneration. He was therefore invited to discuss the subject of "Christian Training," before the Association to which he belonged; and, in compliance, he wrote his two discourses on Christian Nurture, and read them to that body — apparently to its satisfaction, for it voted their publication. But a request from a member of the Publishing Committe of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society (Orthodox,) induced the author to transfer the manuscript to them. After a very long and thorough examination, it was approved and given to the world by that committee; and was commended, on its first appearance, by leading Calvinists. An agitation, however, soon arose; the Discourses were said to have dangerous tendencies; hostility was secretly instigated by the agency of the Theological Seminary in East Windsor, Ct., the Publishing Committee of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society were alarmed, and suppressed the discourses, after they had been a little while in circulation. The author defended them by an "Argument;" and finally he has republished them, with the appendages that make up this volume.

It is not to be questioned, that the peculiar views of Dr. Bushnell must, if accepted, modify, in many important respects, the whole system of theology, as held by the theologians with whom he stands connected; although, as he says, his views "may be easily set in connection with" any of the prevalent "schemes of doctrine." Yet "doubtless it will fit more awkwardly in some than in others, and make a clumsier figure; for probably some of the schemes are clumsier than others, and more difficult to marry with

Digitized by Google

what is reasonable and scriptural."[1] Nor is this subject important in a theological point of view only. It is invested with the highest importance, when viewed in its practical relations and bearings. And this controversy has a peculiar interest, from the fact of its originating where it does, and being managed as it has thus far been.

We proceed to the task of laying before our readers some account of the sentiments of this volume. And we begin with remarking, that it touches upon a great variety of topics. This was unavoidable from the nature of the subject, the position and aims of the author. The design of the articles, aside from the "Discourses," is more fully to develope some points therein presented, and to defend the whole against the attacks made upon them.

The position with which the author starts in his "Discourses" is, "That the child is to grow up a Christian. In other words, the aim, and expectation should be, not, as is commonly assumed, that the child is to grow up in sin, to be converted after he comes to a mature age; but that he is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years. I do affirm, that every child may, in fact and without exception, be so trained, that he will certainly grow up a Christian."[2] He maintains that "it is the very character and mark of all unchristian education, that it brings up the child for future conversion."[3] And he very significantly asks — "Which, in truth, is better for them, to grow up in sin under scripture light, with a heart hardened by so many religious lessons; or to grow up in sin unvexed and unannoyed by the wearisome drill of lectures that only discourage all practical benefit? Which is better, to be piously brought up in sin, or to be allowed quietly to vegetate in it."[4] He declares, "Our very theory of religion is, that men are to grow up in evil, and be dragged into the Church of God by conquest. The world is to lie in halves, and the kingdom of God is to stretch itself side by side with the kingdom of darkness, making sallies into it, and taking captive those who are sufficiently hardened and bronzed in guiltiness to be con-

[1] p. 80. [2] p. 6. [3] p. 11. [4] p. 12.

Digitized by Google

verted."[5] On the other hand, he affirms — "Never is it too early for good to be communicated. Infancy and childhood are the ages most pliant to good. And who can think it necessary that the plastic nature of childhood must first be hardened into stone, and stiffened into enmity towards God, and all duty, before it can become a candidate for Christian character! There could not be a more unnecessary mistake, and it is as unnatural and pernicious, I fear, as it is unnecessary."[6] He maintains, "that christian piety should begin in other and milder forms of exercise, than those which commonly distinguish the conversion of adults — that Christ himself, by that renewing spirit which can sanctify from the womb, should be practically infused into the childish mind; in other words, that the house, having a domestic spirit of grace dwelling in it, should become the church of childhood, the table and hearth a holy rite, and life an element of saving power. Something is wanted that is better than teaching, something that transcends mere effort and will-work — the loveliness of a good life, the repose of faith, the confidence of righteous expectation, the sacred and cheerful liberty of the spirit — all glowing about the young soul, as a warm and genial nurture, and forming in it, by methods that are silent and imperceptible, a spirit of duty and religious obedience to God. This only is christian nurture, the nurture of the Lord."[7]

We now call attention to the manner and the means, by which he thinks the work is effected. In doing this, we shall let the author speak for himself; and as the views are somewhat new, we shall be pardoned in making pretty large extracts.

He says: "If we narrowly examine the relation of parent and child, we shall not fail to discover something like a law of organic connection, as regards character, subsisting between them. Such a connection as makes it easy to believe, and natural to expect that the faith of the one will be propagated in the other. Perhaps I should rather say, such a connection as induces the conviction that the character of one is actually included in that of the other, as a seed is formed in the capsule; and being there matured, by a nutriment derived from the stem, is gradually

[5] p. 25-6. [6] p. 14-5. [7] p. 13.

Digitized by Google

separated from it. It is a singular fact, that many believe substantially the same thing in regard to evil character, but have no thought of any such possibility in regard to good. There has been much speculation, of late, as to whether a child is born in depravity, or whether the depraved character is superinduced afterwards. But, like many other great questions, it determines much less than is commonly supposed; for according to the most proper view of the subject, a child is really not born till he emerges from the infantile state, and never before that time can be said to receive a separate and properly individual nature. The declaration of Scripture, and the laws of physiology, I have already intimated, compel the belief that a child's nature is somehow depravated by descent from parents, who are under the corrupting effects of sin. But this, taken as a question relating to the mere *punctum temporis*, or precise point of birth, is not a question of any so grave import, as is generally supposed; for the child, after birth, is still within the matrix of the parental life, and will be more or less for many years. And the parental life will be flowing into him all that time, just as naturally, and by a law as truly organic, as when the sap of the trunk flows into a limb. We must not govern our thoughts, in such a matter, by our eyes; and because the physical separation has taken place, conclude that no organic relation remains. Even the physical being of the child is dependent still for nutrition on organic processes not in itself. Meantime, the mental being and character have scarcely begun to have a proper individual life. Will, in connection with conscience, is the basis of personality, or individuality, and these exist as yet only in their rudimental type, as when the form of a seed is beginning to be unfolded at the root of a flower. At first the child is held as a mere passive lump in the arms, and he opens into conscious life under the soul of the parent streaming into his eyes and ears, through the manners and tones of the nursery. The kind and degree of passivity are gradually changed as life advances. A little further on it is observed that a smile wakens a smile — any kind of sentiment or passion playing in the face of the parent, wakens a responsive sentiment or passion. Irritation irritates, a frown withers, love expands a look congenial to itself, and why not holy love? Next the ear is opened to the understanding of words, but what words the child shall hear, he cannot choose, and has as little capacity to select the sentiments that are poured into his soul. Farther on, the parents begin to govern him by appeals to will, expressed in commands, and whatever their requirement may be, he can as little withstand it, as the violet can cool the scorching sun, or the tattered leaf can tame the hurricane. Next they appoint his school, choose his books,

Digitized by Google

regulate his company, decide what form of religion, and what religious opinions he shall be taught, by taking him to a church of their own selection. In all this, they infringe upon no right of the child, they only fulfil an office which belongs to them. Their will and character are designed to be the matrix of the child's will and character. Meantime he approaches more and more closely, and by a gradual process, to the proper rank and responsibility of an individual creature, during all which process of separation, he is having their exercises and ways translated into him. Then, at last, he comes forth to act his part in such color of evil, (and why not of good?) as he has derived from them. The tendency of all our modern speculations is to an extreme individualism, and we carry our doctrines of free will so far as to make little or nothing of organic laws; not observing that character may be, to a great extent, only the free developement of exercises previously wrought in us, or extended to us, when other wills had us within their sphere. All the Baptist theories of religion are based in this error. They assume as a first truth, that no such thing is possible as an organic connection of character, an assumption which is plainly refuted by what we see with our eyes, and, as I shall by and by show, by the declarations of Scripture. We have much to say also, in common with the Baptists, about the beginning of moral agency, and we seem to fancy that there is some definite moment when a child becomes a moral agent, passing out of a condition where he is a moral nullity, and where no moral agency touches his being. Whereas he is rather to be regarded at the first, as lying within the moral agency of the parent and passing out by degrees through a course of mixed agency, to a proper independency and self possession. The supposition that he becomes, at some certain moment, a complete moral agent, which a moment before he was not, is clumsy and has no agreement with observation. The separation is gradual. He is never, at any moment after birth, to be regarded as perfectly beyond the sphere of good and bad exercises; for the parent exercises himself in the child, playing his emotions and sentiments, and working a character in him, by virtue of an organic power. And this is the very idea of Christian education, that it begins with nurture or cultivation. And the intention is that the Christian life and spirit of the parents shall flow into the mind of the child, to blend with his incipient and half-formed exercises; that they shall thus beget their own good within him, their thoughts, opinions, faith and love, which are to become a little more, and yet a little more, his own separate exercise, but still the same in character. The contrary assumption, that virtue must be the product of separate and absolutely independent choice, is pure assump-

Digitized by Google

tion. As regards the measure of personal merit and demerit, it is doubtless true that every subject of God is to be responsible only for what is his own. But virtue still is rather a *state* of being than an act or series of acts; and if we look at the causes which induce or prepare such a state, the will of the person himself may have a part among those causes more or less important, and it works no absurdity to suppose that one may be even prepared to such a state, by causes prior to his own will; so that, when he sets off to act for himself, his struggle and duty may be rather to sustain and perfect the state begun, than to produce a new one. Certain it is that we are never, at any age, so independent as to be wholly out of the reach of organic laws which affect our character. All society is organic — the church, the state, the school, the family, — and there is a spirit in each of these organisms, peculiar to itself, and more or less hostile, more or less favorable to religious character, and to some extent, at least, sovereign over the individual man."[8]

The views of the author, in relation to the organic unity of the family, would seem to be stated with sufficient clearness and perspicuity, in the above extract. But it seems, some persons received impressions from it not intended by the author. To develope his view more clearly he adds the following:—

"What then do we mean by the organic unity of the family? It will be understood of course, that we do not speak of a physical or vascular connection, for, after birth, there is no such connection existing, any more than there is between persons of different families. In so far, however, as a connection of parentage, or derivation has affected the character, that fact must be included though it cannot be regarded as a chief element in the unity asserted. Perhaps I shall be understood with the greatest facility, if I say that the family is such a body, that a power over character is exerted therein, *which cannot properly be called influence.* We commonly use the term *influence* to denote a persuasive power, or a governmental power, exerted purposely, and with a conscious design to effect some result in the subject. In maintaining the organic unity of the family, I mean to assert, that a power is exerted by parents over children, not only when they teach, encourage, persuade and govern, but without any purposed control whatever. The bond is so intimate that they do it unconsciously and undesignedly — they must do it. Their charac-

[8] pp. 18–21.

Digitized by Google

ter, feelings, spirit and principles must propagate themselves, whether they will or not. However, as influence, in the sense just given, cannot be *received* by childhood, prior to the age of reason and deliberative choice, the control of parents purposely exerted, must be regarded, during that early period, as an absolute force, not as influence. All such acts of control therefore must, in metaphysical propriety, and as far as the child is concerned, be classed under the general denomination of *organic* causes. And thus *whatever* power over character is exerted in families, one side of consent, in the children, and even before they have come to the age of rational choice, must be taken as organic power, in the same way as if the effect accrued under a law of simple contagion. So too when the child performs acts of will, under parental direction, that involve results of character, without knowing or considering that they do, these must be classed in the same manner.

"In general, then, we find the organic unity of the family, in every exertion of power over character, which is not exerted *and* received as influence; that is with a *design* to address the choice on one side, and *a sense* of responsible choice on the other. Or, to use language more popular, we conceive the manners, personal views, prejudices, practical motives and spirit of the house, as an atmosphere which passes into all and pervades all, as naturally as the air they breathe. This, however, not in any such absolute or complete sense as to leave no room for individual distinctions. Sometimes the two parents will have a very different spirit themselves, though the grace of God is pledged to make the better, if it be truly right and hindered by no gross inconsistencies, victorious. Sometimes the child, passing into the sphere of other causes, as in the school, the church, neighboring families, or general society, will emerge and take a character partially distinct — partially, I say, never wholly. The order of the house will always be in his garments, and the internal difficulties with which he has to struggle, will spring of the family seeds planted in his nature."[9]

But in maintaining these positions, he would not be understood as excluding the supernatural element. He maintains, that in a truly Christian family, a supernatural element is infused into its organism: "that the Christian family and its organic laws are all penetrated by the supernatural element; and as the family is closer about the child, and touches him in points more numerous, and ways

[9] pp. 185–6.

Digitized by Google

more soverign over character, 'the church in the house' has a great deal more to do with him, in the first years of his life, than the church universal, or any public sacrament."[10] Hence he adopts as his own, the following extract, except the words "incorporate by means of the church."

"Christianity is in one view, as I have said before, the perfection of nature. Its relation to the world is never, as the sect spirit assumes, abrupt, violent, fantastic, or magical. Christ came truly *in the flesh*, and his Church is in the flesh still. But he came, at the same time, as a true real revelation of a higher life in the world; a life that was not in it before; a life that has been in it always since, and according to his own promise will be so always to the end of time. Christianity then, is not the mere constitution of nature, as it stood before, but the fact of a divine, supernatural constitution, *incorporated with the course of nature, by means of the church.* To question this, is to question the fact of the incarnation itself, and involves the very essence of rationalism. The Church accordingly is the proper object of *faith*, (as in the Creed,) no less than the person of the theanthropic Saviour himself. To resolve it into the laws of our common life, is infidelity in disguise. At the same time, its whole constitution is in harmony with the laws of this life. *It is the supernatural in human natural form.* The higher life of the Church is the life of humanity itself, exalted into its own proper sphere. The new creation then carries out and completes the sense of the old creation. *It is the old organism still, with all its original necessary laws;* only lifted into a higher order of existence. Such as it is, however, its results spring not from the flesh, as such, but from the presence of supernatural power and resources made permanent in the flesh by Jesus Christ; and we might as well pretend to reduce the miracles of healing which Christ once wrought, to the general category of animal magnetism, as undertake to resolve the objective grace of the Church into the action of laws that begin and end with the constitution of our human nature in its common form."[11]

Or in his own language:—

"When we come to the case of the child, who I have said ought to *grow up as a Christian*, and not to be trained up for future conversion, I must mean, of course, that there is a dispen-

[10] p. 98. [11] pp. 97, 98.

Digitized by Google

sation of the Spirit for all ages; one appropriate to the adult, and one appropriate to the rudimental and unreflective age previous to moral action. And here, during the period in which the child is wholly or principally subject to organic laws, the problem is to prepare him to such a *status*, or *disposedness*, that he will set off, when he comes to his proper individuality, as a true disciple. This, to the child, is his effectual calling. If I say that the result comes to pass in virtue of the parental character and treatment as an organic power; it is only in the certainty that this character and treatment are themselves products of a supernatural grace, wielded also by a supernatural grace, and attended by the same working in the child or subject."[13]

We have been thus full upon this point, because it seems to us a great and much needed truth is here developed — one that has been too much lost sight of, in all our means and methods of religious training, to say nothing of the intellectual and moral — a circumstance that is fraught with great practical evils.

Whoever reflects at all upon the views of Christian nurture here developed, must perceive at once, that peculiar views of human nature must lie behind this scheme, or at its very foundation. But upon this point, our author has made no distinct and formal announcement. The following is the only passage that even borders upon anything like a distinct statement upon this point:

"The natural pravity of man is plainly asserted in the Scriptures, and if it were not, the familiar laws of physiology would require us to believe, what amounts to the same thing. And if neither Scripture nor physiology taught us the doctrine, if the child was born as clear of natural prejudice or damage, as Adam before his sin, spiritual education, or, what is the same, probation, that which trains a being for a stable, intelligent virtue hereafter, would still involve an experiment of evil, therefore a fall and bondage under the laws of evil; so that, view the matter as we will, there is no so unreasonable assumption, none so wide of all just philosophy, as that which proposes to form a child to virtue, by simply educing or drawing out what is in him. The growth of Christian virtue is no vegetable process, no mere onward developement. It involves a struggle with evil, a fall and rescue. The soul becomes established in holy virtue, as a free exercise, only as it is passed round the corner of fall and redemp-

[13] pp. 103–4.

Digitized by Google

tion, ascending thus unto God through a double experience, in which it learns the bitterness of evil and the worth of good, fighting its way out of one and achieving the other as a victory. The child, therefore, may as well begin life under a law of hereditary damage, as to plunge himself into evil by his own experiment, which he will as naturally do from the simple impulse of curiosity, or the instinct of knowledge, as from any noxious quality in his mould derived by descent. For it is not sin which he derives from his parents; at least not sin in any sense which imports blame, but only some prejudice to the perfect harmony of his mould, some kind of pravity or obliquity which inclines him to evil. These suggestions are offered, not as necessary to be received in every particular, but simply to show that the scheme of education proposed, is not to be identified with another, which assumes the radical goodness of human nature, and according to which, if it be true, Christian education is insignificant." [13]

From this, as well as from the general views of Christian nurture developed in this volume, two things are clear, both of which are negations, viz: that he neither holds to the doctrine of total depravity, as asserted in the creed, nor to that of "the radical goodness of human nature." He manifestly occupies a position somewhere between these two extremes. Precisely what may be his views upon this point, is a matter not to be definitely settled, without more light upon this most abstruse and difficult subject. But this much *is made* perfectly clear, viz: that he holds there is a natural susceptibility and an adaptedness to good, in the child, as well as to evil. This is a great advance upon the prevalent orthodox view, and one which we suppose will be generally accepted among the liberal party in religion. And this is sufficient, so far as all practical purposes are concerned. Admit this as a practical principle, and it matters very little what metaphysical views of human nature may be held. Well does our author say,—"If our view is false, or the current opinion is true, how miserable is the age of childhood! If it may not grow up in holy virtue,—if it must grow up in sin, till it comes to some definite age, before it is a candidate for repentance and a new life, then during that interval, is it seen to lie under a doom more dismal and hapless, than any other we are acquainted with in this world. Capable

[13] pp. 15, 16.

Digitized by Google

of sin — incapable of repentance! This too of an age most amiable and lovely, and nearest to innocence! Might not the church better say, in her Saviour's name, 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven,' and clasp it to her arms?"[14]

Beside this general aim of the volume before us, many truthful and excellent words are spoken upon other and kindred topics. We should like to present several other extracts; but we have already transcended the limits assigned, and therefore must be content with making two or three brief selections. Here is one on the style of piety in our orthodox churches, full of the most solemn and melancholy truths:

"We have some good points, in which we compare favorably with other Christians, and Christians of other times, but our style of piety is sadly deficient, in many respects, and that to such a degree that we have little cause for self-congratulation. With all our activity and boldness of movement, there is a certain hardness and rudeness, a want of sensibility to things that do not lie in action, which cannot be too much deplored or too soon rectified. We hold a piety of conquest rather than of love. A kind of public piety that is strenuous and fiery on great occasions, but wants the beauty of holiness, wants constancy, singleness of aim, loveliness, purity, richness, blamelessness, and — if I may add another term not so immediately religious, but one that carries, by association, a thousand religious qualities — wants domesticity of character; wants them, I mean, not as compared with the perfect standard of Christ, but as compared with other examples of piety that have been given in former times, and others that are given now.

"For some reason, we do not make a Christian atmosphere about us,— do not produce the conviction that we are living unto God. There is a marvelous want of savor in our piety. It is a flower of autumn, colored as highly as it need be to the eye, but destitute of fragrance. It is too much to hope that, with such an instrument, we can fulfill the true idea of Christian education. Any such hope were even presumptuous. At the same time, there is no so ready way of removing the deficiencies just described, as to recall our churches to their duties in domestic life; those humble daily, hourly duties, where the spirit we breathe shall be a perpetual element of power and love bathing the life of childhood."[15]

"Religion is thus a kind of transcendental matter, which belongs to the outside of life, and has no part in the laws

[14] p. 168. [15] pp. 8, 9.

Digitized by Google

by which life is organized — a miraculous epidemic, a fire-ball shot from the moon, something holy because it is from God, but so extraordinary, so out of place, that it cannot suffer any vital connexion with the ties and causes and forms and habits, which constitute the frame of our history. Hence the desultory, hard, violent and often extravagant or erratic character it manifests. Hence, in part, the dreary years of decay and darkness, that interspace our months of excitement and victory."[16] We most heartily wish such earnest words of solemn truth would get audience in all our churches, and especially in those which claim the exclusive title of evangelical; for they are much needed, as the world will bear witness.

This book is written in a clear, vigorous, straight-forward and manly style. The author aims to say what he means, and that too, in his own way. And although it contains some rather pungent and perhaps severe rebukes, we cannot perceive, that any thing is said in a bad spirit. He has spoken with great plainness and frankness upon most of his topics, though with much caution in the choice of language, as might be expected from the position he holds, and the aims with which he wrote. The following extracts will show his aims, and serve as an exhibition of his fearless independence: "I did not draw up this scheme of nurture to meet the uses or gratify the opinions of any sect. It is a first maxim with me, as I think it should be in this age, of every one who pretends to think at all, to reach after the most comprehensive form of truth possible; to see how far I may dissolve into unity, in the views I present, the conflicting opinions by which men are divided, giving them back all which they are after, in a form which they can accept together. And the fortune of my little book is, in this view, remarkable, though not a surprize to myself."[17]

But notwithstanding these aims and the degree of caution manifested in the "Discourses" in particular, not to give unnecessary offence, the whole volume breathes a manly and independent spirit. The very language shows that it was born in an atmosphere of manly and Christian independence. And in his "Argument," he does not hes-

[16] p. 69. [17] p. 81.

Digitized by Google

itate to manifest his feelings of independence in the most decided terms. The following may serve as samples of this: "I submit to no human limitation. I ask no human shelter." [18]

"At the same time, it will be seen, for I desire to hang out no false colors, that while I was careful in the "Discourses" to advance nothing of importance, which I knew to be irreconcilable with doctrinal views held by any theologic school among us, I do, in my present article, declare opinions that certainly cannot be reconciled with the views of many, especially those who are maintaining, as ancient, the new-light opinions of the last century. I hope my frankness now will gain me a degree of confidence, which I failed to secure by reserve and caution before. Meantime, as it would be far more respectable for the churches, and quite as pleasant to me that, when an alarm is raised, it should have some intelligent reference to errors advanced, I suggest to those who have been so unfortunate here as to miss their occasion, that now is the time when a panic ought immediately to begin."[19]

In surveying this book as a whole, we can say with the utmost sincerity and truth, that we think Dr. Bushnell is entitled to the thanks of the Christian public, and especially to those of the liberal part of it, for the work he has done in this volume. And although we should not agree with him in every thing, and probably might differ with him in many things, we accept his work as that of a free spirit, — an independent and earnest mind, and one who dares to give utterance to his own deliberate convictions, regardless alike of the smiles and the frowns of his sect. For this reason, as well as for the important truths presented in his book, we wish it a wide circulation and perusal. Its counsels and admonitions are much needed at this time, in all directions, and not the least among those with whom he holds ecclesiastical connexion. He has uttered an appeal upon Christian nurture, which we hope may be widely heard and heeded. D. F.

[18] p. 79. [19] p. 104, 5

Digitized by Google

Art. XII.

Temptation, its evil Effects, and their Remedy.

What is temptation? From what source does it come? What gives it the power it exerts? Such questions are very naturally suggested to the mind, when seriously contemplating the subject.

As man is the subject on which temptation is exerted, it seems proper to consider him as to his constitutional liability to be tempted, and to inquire what there is in him which constitutes this liability.

Let it be understood that we are now to consider man as he comes from the hand of the Creator; and not as a subject of commendation, or censure, for the manner in which he employs the faculties which are given him in his constitution. Nothing can be more certain, or more apparent, than that man is constituted a dependent being, and a being of a variety of wants. For his dependence he is worthy of neither praise nor blame; and the same may be said of his constitutional wants. He is incapable of being independent; and equally so of rendering himself free from wanting. Moreover, man is constitutionally possessed of a variety of appetites and passions. For being possessed of these he is worthy of neither praise nor blame.

More might be said on the subject of man's constitution, and of what we find in him which renders him subject to be tempted; but what has already been suggested may suffice for our present purpose.

Now if man wanted nothing, and had no appetites to be gratified, it does not seem that he would be liable to be tempted. There certainly can be no temptation where there is nothing offered which is in any way desirable.

It will not be deemed irrelevant here to refer to the first

Digitized by Google

temptation, recorded in the Scriptures: — (Gen. iii. 4, 5,) "And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die. For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Here take notice that what was promised by the tempter was something desirable, as we are informed in the next verse: — "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise; she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat." If the woman had not wanted food; if her eyes could not be pleased; and she had no desire to be any wiser, or to know any thing of which she was ignorant, it is very evident there would have been no temptation. We come then to the safe conclusion that man's liability to be tempted is found in his natural and constitutional wants.

What is temptation? Considered in the abstract, it is the offer or promise of some desirable thing, on condition of stepping aside from known duty, to obtain it. From what source does temptation come? To give a right answer to this question, and to make the answer clearly understood, perhaps is somewhat difficult. To be sure, acocrding to views which have been generally entertained, there is no difficulty in answering this question. The devil is the tempter, and he is the source from which all temptation proceeds. Nor when we take this answer into consideration, and endeavor to examine its claims to credibility, we are under the necessity of asking some questions respecting the devil. Who is he? is the first question. Tradition says he was once a bright and glorious angel in heaven; and that in heaven he sinned; and that from heaven he was banished by the authority and power of the Creator. But before we can be fully satisfied that this is a true account, we want the proof by which it is supported. In the Scriptures of divine authority, have we any such account? This cannot with safety be said. Have we then any other reliable authority for believing this account? We think not. But we are told that man never could have been tempted and led into sin, if there had not been a tempter. True, but does that prove that the tempter must have once been a glorious angel in hea-

Digitized by Google

ven, and for his sin committed there, been driven from the blessed abode? Such argument has no legitimate relation to the subject. In the scripture, before quoted, the tempter is called "the serpent." But is there any scripture authority for believing this serpent was once a glorous angel, any more than for believing that Moses' rod, or the rods of the Egyptian magicians, which were turned into serpents, were once glorious angels? Look at another phasis of this subject. If man could not have been tempted and led into sin, without a sinful angel to tempt him, how could that glorious angel have been tempted and led into sin, without some other sinful agent to tempt him? So we might go on; but where should we stop? It really seems a matter of importance that we should know who, or what our tempter, is, and where he has his abode. It appears utterly impossible that a single created being should be every where present, at the same time, to carry on the work of temptation with individual mortals in all parts of the world.

Were we capable of fully knowing ourselves, and of surveying all our wants, all our passions, all our natural propensities, and appetites; and together with a clear view of all these, could we as clearly discover all the objects in any way adapted to them, it is believed we should very well understand the location of the tempter. We should, unquestionably, find him within the circle of our mental vision. But it is not believed that this tempter is a distinct, sentient being, but that he is composed of the action and force of all the above-named particulars; and depending for his existence on the imperfection of man.

Now that this tempter should be personified and called by a characteristic name, or names, is by no means inconsistent with propriety. One of the best scholars, whose writings we find in the Scriptures, and whose acquaintance with proper usage of language was not surpassed, has given to charity the various characteristics of a sentient being, (see 1 Cor. xiii. 4, &c.): "Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all

Digitized by Google

things. Charity never faileth." No one supposes that the apostle was here speaking of a personal being. The Saviour called Judas a devil, and applied the name Satan to Peter; because they sustained the character of an adversary.

What gives the tempter the power he exerts? Evidently this power comes from the elements which constitute him. It is the force of want, of desire, of appetite, of passion, together with the attractions of objects adapted to them. But here arises an important query: Is not the Creator the author of all these elements of which we have spoken? and are they not all found in the constitution of man, and in those objects around us, which are adapted to our wants? All this must be allowed. Where then is the moral evil? Moral evil or sin is the result of deception. Remember, the woman said, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." And St. Paul says,—"The woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." And again; (2 Cor. xi. 3,) he says, "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." It is evident that transgression comes of deception, and consists in endeavoring to satisfy a natural, constitutional desire, in a way forbidden. Our Creator has constituted us with no natural desires which may not be satisfied in a lawful way. St. James comprehends the subject of temptation in a few words: (ch. i. 14, 15,) "But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." The word here rendered *enticed*, Parkhurst explains "to take or catch, properly with a bait, as birds or fishes are caught." And, referring to 2 Peter, ii. 14—18, and to the passage above quoted from James, he gives us what Dr. Doddridge says on the passage, which follows: "These words have a singular beauty and elegance, containing an allusion to the method of drawing fishes out of the water with a hook, concealed under the bait, which they greedily devour." Parkhurst farther adds:—"Thus also Xenophon, (Memor. Socrat. lib. ii. chap. 1, Sec. 4,) where disputing with Aristippus about pleasure, he says some animals are *caught* (using the same word) by their belly, or appetite." If the little fishes were not deceived, if they knew that that tempting bait, which they are so eager

Digitized by Google

to swallow, concealed a deadly hook, from which there could be no escape, if the bait was sallowed, hunger could not induce them to swallow the bait. But being deceived, they eat and die. They were tempted and beguiled, by which they lost their lives. If the fishes had wanted nothing, of course there could have been no bait adapted to their wants, and therefore no temptation could have existed. I wish the reader to see that the temptation comes from the force of appetite and the influence of that which is adapted to it; and that all the adversary, tempter, devil or satan there is to be found, must be found in these. As it is with the fishes which are caught with a baited hook, and as it is with birds which are taken in a baited snare, so the wise man represents the lot of deceived mortals. (Eccles. ix. 12.) "For man also knoweth not his time; as the fishes that are taken in an evil net, and as the birds that are caught in the snare; so are the sons of men snared in an evil time, when it falleth suddenly upon them."

It may be said by some, that there is a wide difference between the case of men and fishes; for we know when we do wrong, whereas the fishes do not. This is true; but it alters not the case, as to the deception. Man's deception, consists not in ignorance of what right is, but in believing that good is to be gained by going contrary to it. Eve knew what was forbidden, and answered the serpent accordingly; this required the serpent's effort to persuade her to disbelieve what she had been told, and to believe that good to her would be obtained by her disobedience, while the threatened consequences might be avoided. She was beguiled: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." All our transgressions, and all our temptations which lead to them, are here rightly represented.

Having found out the nature of this moral disorder, which is denominated sin; and having obtained an understanding of the nature of the cause by which it is produced, it becomes necessary to ascertain its cure, and the means of its application. This does not appear to be a difficult undertaking. The cure is the knowledge of the truth. Jesus says:—"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." That is, free from the bondage of sin. "Whoso committeth sin, is the servant of sin." If we knew with certainty, that we could not avoid

Digitized by Google

the evil of sin, if we commit it, we should not yield to temptation. If the deception, "Ye shall not surely die," could not be believed, we should escape. But the human mind seems ever at work to cherish and foster this deception: "Ye shall not surely die." God said to our first parent, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." And by Moses he said, he would not, "by any means clear the guilty." But temptation continues its beguiling influences with all people, old and young, male and female; and however startling it may seem, it is evidently a fact, that what, in all ages, and among all people, with few exceptions, has been believed to be a truth, in place of tending to banish the fatal deception, has given it efficient support. Perhaps the reader will wonder at this statement, and ask, if the warning voice of all established hierarchies in the world, has not given assurance to sinners of their danger, and of their fearful doom? Let us here ask, if that voice has not always held out some means by which the sinner may escape the awful doom threatened? O yes; this every body knows. Very well; and what more did the serpent say? or what more do temptations now suggest? The thief, who, under the cover of darkness, breaks into houses and steals, does not feel certain that he shall escape detection and punishment; if he did, he would not fear. But being afraid, he endeavors to hide himself. And it is doubtless true that all transgressors are more or less afraid they may not escape the punishment which their religious education has taught them to fear; but they intend to avail themselves of those means of escape, which that education has presented to them. The religious education, of which we speak, has placed the punishment of sin in a future life; and the means of escaping it in the present, and during its continuance. If all people really believed, that every transgression and disobedience would certainly meet a just recompense of reward; and that God has provided no means or conditions of escape, would they transgress? If so, then it seems that all deception is out of the question, and that temptation has no need of beguiling any one. But this is not true. St. Paul holds the following language:— "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should

Digitized by Google

let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward: how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." (Heb. ii. 1, 2, 3.) Are we not here certified, that under the Mosaic dispensation, every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense, and that under the gospel dispensation transgression and disobedience cannot escape a just recompense? Surely nothing can be more evident. The fact then is made plain, that neither the covenant of the law, nor that of the gospel, makes any provision for escaping a just recompense for sins committed. The reader should remember that we are not in search of a cure for the evil of a just recompense for sin; but a cure for sin itself. This cure the gospel provides and applies; and this is done by its doctrine, which not only undeceives the beguiled heart, which effectually bruises the serpent's head, but presents to the understanding the all-attracting beauties of duty and of holiness. This done, and sin is hated and obedience is loved. This is the salvation of the gospel; and in this flows that pure river of the water of life, in the midst of the street of which is the tree of life.

The labor required, in the ministration of the gospel, designed to effect man's recovery from the moral disease of sin, must be directed to two very material points. Men need to be fully convinced that in every tempting bait which invites to a departure from duty, there is a deadly, a fatal hook, which is sure to hold him who swallows the bait, and to recompense his error with death. "The wages of sin is death." On the other hand, men require a clear view of the beauties of holiness and the perfect adaptation of every required duty to their wants.

The ministers of the gospel of man's salvation must be possessed of that wisdom which is from above, which "is first pure, then gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." With this wisdom, they will look on sinners with the disposition and spirit which the Father of mercies has manifested by so loving the world as to send his only begotten Son for its salvation. Sinners of all discriptions, and of

Digitized by Google

every grade, should be considered as objects of love and pity, and looked upon as are the sick by kind and skilful physicians. H. B.

Art. XIII.

Protestantism — Universalism — in France.

In the year 1559 the Protestants of France held their first national synod in Paris. The meeting and all the proceedings were in private, through fear of the persecutions then going on against all followers of the new doctrines. This synod adopted a confession, a catechism, and an order of worship, which had been prepared by Calvin. The confession consisted of forty articles. In these the Apostles' creed, the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, are declared to be agreeable to the word of God, (Art. v.) The fall of Adam and his consequent entire corruption, (ix.); the transfer of his sin to his posterity, (x.), "so that even the choicest of God's saints, although they do resist it, yet are they defiled with very many sins and offences so long as they live in this world," (xi.), and the doctrine of election and reprobation, wherein it is declared God chooses whom he will, "without any consideration of works, leaving the rest in their sins and damnable estate, that he may show forth in them his justice, as in the elect he doth most illustriously declare the riches of his mercy," (xii); all these are embodied in the confession, and set forth with a plainness of speech which shows a determination to be understood. The Calvinistic platform is asserted to agree "with that discipline which the Lord Jesus has established," (xxix.); and the equality of all the churches is set forth as the basis of union and government, (xxx.).

In the year 1571, in the reign of Charles IX., the National Synod of Rochelle sanctioned the Forty Articles; and they were publicly confirmed and agreed to at the ses-

Digitized by Google

sion in 1660 in the reign of Louis XIV. During this interval of an hundred years, the Protestants suffered the most terrible persecutions; and France was torn asunder by the civil wars between the Catholic and Protestant parties. At length, however, Henry IV. from political motives openly professed the Catholic religion, and took sides with its party; but in 1578 he issued the edict of Nantes, granting to his Protestant subjects equal civil rights, equal privileges in the schools and universities; made them eligible to all places of trust, allowed them to establish public worship throughout the kingdom, and bestowed 40,000 crowns annually for the payment of their clergy. Under this edict they flourished greatly, and reckoned a population of nearly a million and a half, and from 700 to 800 regular churches; some of which were very large, having three or four pastors. But there is reason to fear that, all things considered, they did not use their privileges as wisely and meekly as their position required; and their wily enemies were continually working to procure their downfall and destruction. The celebrated Richelieu threw all his power, as prime minister, against them, and succeeded at last in wresting from the Reformers their fortifications, castles, and garrisoned towns, and reducing them to subjection.

After some years of plotting and intrigue, the Jesuits finally accomplished their object, and, under Louis XIV., procured the revocation of the edict of Nantes; and engaged the king to destroy the heretics, or compel them by persecution to return to the bosom of the mother church. Previous to the public revocation, troops were sent into the provinces to seize the Protestants, waste their property, and inflict all manner of injuries upon them; and, if possible, to prevent their escape from the country. Notwithstanding, more than half a million of the best and most useful citizens of France made their way to foreign lands, where their descendants are still to be found, enriching the country with their industry and skill. Some thirty thousand fled into England, and thence many of them came to this country. Some of the first families in our land are proud of their descent from the Huguenots of France.

From the date of the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the Protestants ceased to be recognized as a religious body,

Digitized by Google

and were deprived of all religious and civil rights. For a century the small remnant of them left in the kingdom, met for worship secretly, in the forests, in caves, and sometimes in lone private rooms; and this always with the fear of galleys, dungeons and scaffolds before their eyes. And it may surprise some of our readers to be told, that even as late as 1762, only a few years before the opening of the American Revolution, François Rochelle was executed upon a public scaffold, for the crime of having performed divine service for his brethren! And the civil rights of the Protestants, as husbands and wives, as fathers and mothers, and acknowledged children, do not date farther back than 1787, being one of the good acts of the unfortunate Louis XVI.

Towards the close of the French Revolution, when, under the consulship of Napoleon, Christian worship was re-established, a law was passed which, from the month of its date, was called the Law of Germinal, securing civil liberty to the Protestants, and regulating their ecclesiastical organization. It recognizes the National Protestant Church, made up of independent congregations, each governed by its own consistory, which is composed of the pastor or pastors, and ruling elders. It allows the pastors to be freely elected by the consistories, and gives no power to the government to remove them, or withhold the sanction of the royal ordinance. An annual endowment or appropriation is made by the Chambers, for the support of the ministers, as of a National Establishment. Nothing is said in the Law of Germinal respecting the Forty Articles, and no minister has been required to acknowledge or subscribe them, since 1802. The law has not preserved the national synod, the only power in the old Reformed Church which could establish a doctrinal basis, or Confession of Faith, for the whole community; and consequently, there is no official or authoritative creed which all are compelled to believe, as the condition of being regarded orthodox.

Immediately after the passage of the Germinal Law, efforts were made to re-open Protestant churches, and collect congregations. According to the law, six thousand names were necessary for the erection of a consistorial church, and obtaining the government endowment; and it is a fact, pleasantly contrasting with the persecutions already

Digitized by Google

noted, that numbers of Catholics gave in their names in different places, to make up the required amount, and enabled their Protestant brethren to establish public worship, and enjoy its privileges. Since the law in question went into operation, the Reformed Church of France has been steadily increasing, and there are now more than five hundred ministers in the establishment. Fifty years ago the whole body of Protestants in Paris assembled in a single room. At the present time they have three churches, the largest of which, the Oratoire, holds upwards of two thousand hearers, and is filled to overflowing; many of the regular attendants being Catholics, who are ready to hear and willing, when convinced, openly to profess.[1]

As to the dogmatic or doctrinal position of the National Protestant Church, it would be difficult to say any thing of universal application. The Law of Germinal not recognizing the national synod, nor requiring the clergy to subscribe to the Forty Articles of the old regime; every one is left free to follow truth wherever she leads, and to investigate the claims of all doctrines. Of course a great variety of opinions must necessarily exist; though the Bible is the common platform on which all take position. "I am confident," says an eminent clergyman of the church, "that not one of us can be called a Rationalist in its genuine German sense. There is not one of us who does not consider the Scriptures as a positive revelation; not one of us who does not consider the sacraments with a deep religious awe; not one of us from whose pulpit do not continually descend into the minds of the congregation the doctrines, that God is the Father of all; Jesus Christ the only Redeemer; man the prodigal son, incapable by his own merits of working out his way home to his Creator; judgment an inevitable account, and immortality our real existence." As to the "ancient creeds," he says, "we preserve them simply as venerable records of the science and piety of our fathers; enjoying for ourselves full freedom of examination and of faith."

We have recently fallen in with a volume, published

[1] For the benefit of our readers who may visit Paris, we give the location of the churches. *Oratoire*, 157 Rue St. Honoré, near the Louvre; *St. Mary's*, Rue St. Antoine 216; and *Pentemont*, Rue de Grenelle 108, in the Faubourg St. Germain.

Digitized by Google

last season in London, which has furnished us with some interesting information on this head. It is a translation, under the sanction of the author, of a philosophical and theological work by ATHANASE COQEREL, one of the pastors of the Oratiore Church in Paris. The translation is by Rev. D. Davison, and is preceded by an introduction by the author, written expressly for the English edition, dated at Paris, June 1847. The title of the work in French is "Le Christianisme Experimental;" in English, "Christianity: its perfect adaptation to the Mental, Moral and Spiritual Nature of Man." The work assumes to be a complete system of philosophy and of religion; and presents a view of Christianity taken from the two stand points of reason and faith, of human knowledge and divine revelation. And the author tells us that "it is the labor of his whole life, the summary of the long studies of thirty years spent in ministerial duties." Our limits will not permit a full exhibition of the plan and execution of the work; and we shall therefore confine our review of it, to that portion which relates to the present theological condition of the Protestant church of France, and specially to the doctrine of universal redemption.

The great idea which the author elaborates as the basis of philosophy and religion, is Universal Progress as the end of creation; of which the present world and time are but one step or phase. Progress is based on activity. But activity implies freedom; and therefrom comes the possibility of moving away from God, as well as approaching to him. "Whence it follows that, activity being continuous, all creatures, each in its phase of progress, are continually moving onward towards God, or withdrawing from him; an immense retinue, which stretches through all worlds, and extends through all ages, whose stations are the stars, which has but one end, as the limit of its career — the infinite." The fall in the dogmatic sense of the word, is the first developement of activity in the wrong direction; the first step taken by man in the path contrary to progress, or away from God. Original sin, or the communication of it to the race, is only such an influence as is exerted by every one on those associated with him. A single member of the social compact, by a backward movement, will draw the whole body in the same direc-

Digitized by Google

tion more or less, according to the amount of his influence. A single man, by withdrawing from God, will retard to some extent all his fellow men. This is all that is meant by the imputation of Adam's sin. Perdition, or damnation, is nothing but the fall prolonged, or extended beyond the present phase of progress into the next; and as activity is continuous, whether in the direction of good or evil, the fall, or sin, and its consequences, would be endless from their nature, if man was left to himself. God, however, neither punishes nor rewards, properly speaking. The wicked punishes himself, and the righteous rewards himself. The justice of God consists in the care which he takes that this necessary order, this regular sequence of cause and effect, in the moral universe, is not interrupted, and that every one reaps the fruit of his doing.

Life is the duration, to each individual, of that part of the phase of progress which is common to him with his fellow men. The whole phase is the duration of the world, or the present order of things. Death is the individual departure from the present phase of progress, of which the end of the world is the completion. Death is only a change in the conditions of existence and the means of progress, or of assimilation to God, which is the meaning of progress. The resurrection, which follows immediately on death, activity being a necessity of the soul, takes us up where death leaves us, whether moving toward God or away from him. But the relations of the Creator and the creature are the same always, in all worlds. Truth, which is what God thinks; holiness, which is what God wills; love, which is God's life; religion, which is God's history; and the freewill of man — these are the same in all worlds, in all phases of progress. As God has but one end in creation, which is approximation toward himself; and as he is infinite in resources and power; in some way all creatures will be drawn into the same upward path. The possibility of departure from God, and therefore of moral evil, were necessary conditions of freewill; and the possibility of the departure being continued endlessly, is a necessary result of continuous activity. How then are these acknowledged facts to be reconciled with the end of creation, the purpose of God—namely, universal progress, or the approach of all intelligences to himself?

Digitized by Google

It is at this point that redemption comes in, whether taking effect in this world, or phase of progress, or in another. Redemption consists in arresting the downward tendency, or illegitimate developement of activity; and in giving to those who are thus arrested in their fall, the means of resuming an upward career toward God. "And the universality of this redemption is a necessary consequence of the unity of our race. As a single fall suffices to drag downward a whole species living in social union, a single redemption raises it again. The whole race is fallen; God in stretching forth his hand to raise, lifts up the whole from its fallen condition."

Such is the line of argument and illustration followed by our author in exposition of his philosophy, as it relates to the end of creation; which is, as we have said, universal progress, or the constant approach of all souls towards God. The following will exhibit the character of his proofs, and the grounds of his philosophical conclusions.

"The proof is, that God is love; — that the power of the affections in God is infinite. It would be limited if God limited redemption.

"The proof will be further found in the unity of our phase of progress, which forms a whole, in which all the parts are so united that a partial or temporary redemption would be at variance with the very progress, which it is its object to direct and confirm.

"A still further proof is the law of social compact: how could this law remain in force in the midst of a race partially saved? It would then become necessary that the laws of social compact should exclude the very highest interests of man, the interests of salvation; and that a man might share every thing with his brethren except redemption and immortality; the horrible and the absurd meet together in such a supposition.

"And the final proof is the generality of the end of creation. The end is the progress of all toward God; and redemption cannot have a less object than creation.

"It may, indeed, be said that to limit is to falsify, and consequently, to destroy it. A partial redemption would soon result in finding no believers.

"Hence the reason why the dogma, "out of the

Digitized by Google

church, no salvation," forms the latent principle of death in all those sects which have embraced or do embrace it.

The universality of redemption never leads to the slightest infraction of free will — the common right of mankind: for freedom of action is the principle and indispensable means of progress; and the very object of redemption is to lead men to, and confirm them in, this path of progress.

"And redemption does not infringe upon the law of difference and inequality; inasmuch as these differences between man and man are necessary to this progress of all, and necessarily taken into account with each."

In the concluding chapter of his work, entitled "The Expectation of Universal Restoration," the author examines the arguments, *pro* and *con*, bearing upon this great question. We should be glad to quote the whole of it, but space will not allow. We must content ourselves with a few items. He says the common systems of theology rather avoid examinining this subject closely, from the conviction that conscience and religiousness furnish objections to the dogma of endless punishment, difficult to remove; and hence the quotation of a few texts exhausts the argument with them. He says it is a dogma which men naturally doubt; and question its moral influence when believed. Endless pain can only be supposed on the ground of endless sin, of which it is the effect; and he grants, as we have seen, that left to itself sin may be endless, and consequently punishments; but "to consider it certain that they are so, is a tremeduous foresight which rests on nothing, and the adherents of this dreadful doctrine take it for granted without looking at its groundwork." He then sets against this *may be* of sin left to itself, the *must be* of Redemption. At the same time, somewhat inconsistently perhaps, he argues that suffering, or the effects of sin, is necessarily instructive and profitable. If so, the possibility of growing worse and worse, or continually retiring farther from God and good, seems scarcely admissable.

After stating that the happiness of the righteous is inseparably inwoven with the restoration of the wicked, and that they love God so much more, as they look forward with joyful confidence to the day when God will be loved

Digitized by Google

by all his creatures; he sums up the argument with the exclamation: "What an affecting and majestic arrangement of the universe, where there is a place for all; and of an immortality where there is an opportunity for all! These thoughts are so delightful and consolatory, that we feel constrained by holy rapture to regard their sublimity as one guaranty more for their truth."

In entering upon the scriptural argument, the author quotes most of the passages on which American Universalists rely for proof of universal restoration; and he argues the case with a great deal of skill and power. The following are among his quotations: John xii. 32; 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6; Titus ii. 11; Heb. ii. 9; 1 John ii. 2; Rom. v. 15, 19; 1 Cor. xv. 21—28; Rom. viii. 19—23; John i. 9; x. 16; Eph. i. 9, 10; Rom. xi. 36, &c. "The general restoration of mankind, in virtue of redemption, is taught," he says, "with a degree of clearness suitable to this mystery. "And this noble and exalted doctrine, the last word of God to man, founded upon the whole of that theory of the gospel which our work has explained, meets with an incomparable guaranty in those passages which seem to attribute the creation to Jesus Christ." Then quoting (John i. 3;) (1 Cor. viii. 6;) (Col. i. 15, 17;) (Heb. i. 2;) he adds, "These texts embrace three distinct ideas: 1st. The origin of all things, God; the supreme, infinite first cause; the spontaneous source from which all things proceed. 2d. The means, instrumentality, agency in creation — Christ, by whom are all things — and who consequently is the first born of creation. 3d. The final object of creation, Christ again, for whom, or in whom, all things consist, renewed and re-created by his redemption." "And who does not see that these revealed truths, the most exalted which the gospel contains, are irreconcileable with the expectation of an eternal hell? We conclude, therefore, that nothing is definite and eternal except heaven — that is to say, progress." [2]

[2] Speaking of the word eternal, as applied to punishment, he says the question is by no means disposed of by the use of this word. In the Greek, this adjective, as well as the substantive from which it is derived, has a variety of meanings. Its primitive meaning is merely that of duration, long or short, definite or indefinite. Jesus said of the fig-tree, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward forever." (Matt. xxi.) Peter saith unto him, thou shalt never wash my feet." (John xii.) In these pas-

Digitized by Google

Such is the philosophy, and such the scriptural argument, of this volume, as they relate to the great subject of human destiny. And now the question naturally arises, Who is Athanase Coquerel? and what relation does this work bear to the theological history or the present dogmatic position of the National Protestant Church of France? These questions we shall now attempt to answer.

Athanase Coquerel is one of the ministers of the Oratoire church in Paris, and one of the most distinguished of the Protestant preachers, known "alike for his learning, his eloquence and his personal worth." Dr. Beard speaks this of him in his notice of his "Reply to Strauss" in the "Voices of the Church." But Coquerel has himself furnished us with the leading facts of his history. After preparing himself for the ministry, being only twenty-one, and twenty-five being the age required by the rules of the French church for settlement, he was invited to preach a few sermons to the French Reformed church, of Amsterdam; and going there with the intention of staying a few weeks only, he remained twelve years! In 1830, Cuvier, the great naturalist, who, as Counsellor of State, and of the University of France, was at the head of the administration of Protestant affairs, knowing his worth

sages *forever* and *never* are the same. It is sometimes taken to express the duration of the present life: "Wherefore if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the *world* standeth," or, "as long as I live." (1 Cor. viii....) In a multitude of other passages, the word merely means the future life in opposition to the present. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this *world*; neither in the *world* to come." (Matt. xii.) The very same word here denotes the life which terminates, and that which has no end; and this text proves beyond dispute that the word does not always bear the meaning of eternal duration, even when it is applied to Christianity. St. Paul uses the word with the same double meaning, "not only in this *world*, but in that which is to come." It is impossible to avoid concluding, from a review of these passages, that the doctrine of eternal punishment is a mere deduction, and not a positive declaration of the sacred books. To say that the future life is endless, and therefore its punishments, is a flagrant example of the "*petitio principii*." Speaking of Matt. xxv. 46, which he calls "the famous passage," he says, "the word *everlasting* in this phrase simply signifies *future*, in opposition to what is *temporal and present*. The sense therefore is this: the wicked shall go to the punishments of the world to come; and the righteous to the life, that is, to the happiness of the new world" — without reference to the duration of either. [B. vi. *Note* 100.

Digitized by Google

and reputation, insisted on his returning to France; and offered him a professorship at Montauban, a Protestant institution in the southern part of the country. Not arriving in season for presentation to this situation, Cuvier, resolved to retain him, created a new situation for him, that of *Pasteur de l' Eglise Reformee de Paris.* For seventeen years past he has filled this place with honor to himself, and with great profit to the Protestant cause in France. In 1839 he was named by the King, *Chevalier de la Legion d'honneur;* an unusual distinction.

The publications of Coquerel are numerous and valuable. His Sacred Biography is highly commended as almost a cyclopedia of religious knowledge; and is now on the desks of most of the ministers in France. His reply to Strauss in Beard's volume, is one of the most able and satisfactory in the collection. During his seventeen years' residence in Paris, he has been constantly preaching to large congregations, acting on committees of the various religious organizations, contributing largely to several religious journals, corresponding incessantly with his fellow ministers in various parts of France, and studying daily the wants and developements of the Protestant congregations of Paris, and of such Catholics as his position brought him into intercourse with. And it is this variety of labor, and these multiplied sources of information, which justify his remark, that he has attained "a thorough knowledge of the situation, the wants, and the spirit of the Protestantism of France."

And now comes the question, what relation does the work in review, with all its Universalism, bear to French Protestantism? It will be readily seen, that if there is a man who can speak with authority respecting the theological or doctrinal position, and wants of the Protestants of France, that man is Athanase Coquerel. The evidence lies in the facts just stated. And while the volume before us is an exposition of his own philosophy and religious faith, as the results of his life study; it is at the same time put forth with the special purpose of meeting actually existing wants and difficulties, and answering to the present phase or developement of the religious mind of France. It is this that gives the book its importance as a valuable contribution to the present history of Universalism. It

Digitized by Google

will be well to hear the author on this point, for his testimony is full and explicit.

"It is evident," says he, "in my mind, as matter of fact and experience, that, in France, amongst the two religious denominations, of French Protestantism — the so called Calvinist and Lutheran churches, an immense majority has been impatiently waiting for a work of this kind; and that beyond the bounds of the reformed communities, numberless are the minds of inconsistent unbelievers, uneasy and undecided as to religious matters, and laboring under the vague desire of meeting with Christian truth under this form. In France, the minds of men are weary with floating to and fro between a dogmatism nearly come to its end, and a dogmatism yet unborn among us; weary of uncertainty and of the bitter and intolerant conditions of the past, whose place, though nearly vacant, has not yet been taken by any new and more welcome guest — and you constantly meet with fatigued wanderers looking out where to fix, where to halt. In the dark or in the dawn, the present generation is searching how to believe, without discord and anathemas; how to believe in the bond of love; how to unite, once for all, reason and faith, and still more, zeal and charity. On all sides you hear discontent and disgust expressed respecting all those imperfect systems now dried up and empty, which satisfy neither the intellect, the conscience, nor the religious instinct of man. Everywhere you meet with men of all classes ardently seeking, out of doors and in private, after the subjective creed; that is to say, drawn out of man considered in himself as a complete being, as a subject existing apart from every other in his inviolable individuality; (this is probably worded in reference to the fashionable German-French-Christian Pantheism, of which we have a weak dilution, a kind of philosophical dribbling in this country;) a creed drawn out of the realities of life, the realities of revelation, from the very depths of creation, from our nature, from God's nature, from the essence and spirit of Christianity. It is this faith which I have ventured to unfold in the following pages, and consequently the work is written for all classes of readers. It is hardly necessary to add that the work throughout has nothing

Digitized by Google

of a sectarian character; indeed it assumes to be far above the level of all sects."

Such is the expose given by the author of the present condition and desires of the religious mind of Protestant France, and of multitudes of minds outside of Protestantism;— and this work, which presents the unity of our race and universal progress as the philosophy of religion and the religion of philosophy; which so luminously sets forth the philosophical and scriptural argument for universal restoration — this work is put forth by the writer, who has had every means of knowing what was wanted, as the only answer to these desires, the only satisfactory response to the yearnings of those minds which, dissatisfied with the worn-out creeds of the past, and disgusted with the conflict of reason and faith in the systems of the present, have impatiently waited for Christian truth offered under this form. This certainly reveals an unexpected state of things, a condition of theological inquiry and progress, in France, or at least among a portion of the people, for which we were not prepared. It shows, very fully and clearly, that the doctrine of universal redemption, is not looked upon as a heresy, nor with alarm or dislike: but, on the contrary, with the welcome of an open mind and a desiring heart. It shows that the dogmas of the church have, to a considerable extent, or with those here represented, reached their culminating point; rather that they have descended far toward the opposite horizon — while the time has come for the introduction of a system of truths more in harmony with the spirit of the gospel, with the wants of man, and with the essence and attributes of God. In a word, it reveals to us the joyful tidings, that multitudes in France have received, or are ready to receive, the sublime and affecting truths of our holy faith — God, the Father of all; Jesus, the brother and Saviour of all; and everlasting progress in knowledge, and love, and blessedness, the final inheritance and heaven of all! This information, so gratifying to us, will, we doubt not, be equally so to our readers. And it certainly furnishes an additional reason, and a weighty one, for sending some competent person on a mission of inquiry and investigation through Europe; or at least Great Britain, Germany, France, Sweden, and perhaps Switzerland. It seems to us that the

Digitized by Google

time has come for some action of this sort; and it is believed there are those in our denomination who are both able and willing to aid in such a movement. "The fields are ripe for the harvest; only the reapers are wanting." At all events we hope the facts here brought to light, will induce the officers of the Historical Society to solicit a correspondence with Coquerel, and through him to open communications with those in other parts of France, whether Protestants of the National (nominally Calvinistic) church, Lutherans, or Catholics, who are with him in sentiment; — and thus ascertain the exact state of things, so far as this is possible in the present stage of the movement.[3]

T. B. T.

[3] Though there are various shades of opinion, as matter of course, where every one is left free to investigate for himself, yet our author says, "I will tranquilly affirm, that not one of the (500) ministers of the church (National Protestant) would sign the confession (the Forty Articles) as it is — for instance, with the article on the eternal damnation of unbaptized children, with the article on irrevocable predestination, and with the Athanasian creed as a sanctioned appendix." Again: "In the French Protestant communities there is, most probably, not to be found a Calvinist or a Lutheran, if to be a Calvinist or Lutheran is to believe all that was taught by the two reformers. Our churches are composed only of Christians, who draw their evangelical faith from the Gospel, with full freedom of examination, and on their individual responsibility." [*Author's Preface, pp.* xxv. xlii.

And now, as this note seems to offer a good opportunity, we wish to add a word in reference to the charges brought against the author and his brethren, of being Rationalists, &c. He alludes in his preface to British and American religious *hawkers, colporteurs,* and *evangelists,* who are sent into France to sell and give away Bibles and Tracts. These filled with a zeal violent in proportion to its ignorance, with no knowledge of the peculiar condition and wants of the population, begin by quarreling with the Catholic priests, creating dissension and bitterness, and renewing the hostility to Protestantism, which those resident in the country, and acquainted with all the elements, social and religious, had mostly overcome. Begining thus, they end by denouncing all the regular ministers, who knowing the evil of such a course, will not join in their violent measures. They declare them wanting in piety, unconverted, enemies of evangelical religion, &c. Recently, inquiring of the editor of an orthodox journal respecting Coquerel, he replied with pharisaic sanctity — "O, he is not an evangelical man; we do not regard him as converted!" Not satisfied with this, they charge them with being Arians, Sabellians, Socinians, Latitudinarians, (this last being coined into French, our author says, for the amiable purpose of abuse,) Unitarians, Rationalists, &c. We design only to allude to the charge of Rationalism. We have already mentioned the "Reply to Strauss" by Coquerel, and we have quoted the direct declaration, "Not one of us is a

Digitized by Google

Art. XIII.

The Gospel History; its Genuineness and Truth.

1. The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels. By Andrews Norton. (In three volumes.) Cambridge, 1846, 1844.
2. Christianity against Infidelity; or, the Truth of the Gospel History. By Thomas B. Thayer. Boston, 1836.
3. The Life of Jesus critically examined by Dr. David Friedrich Strauss. Translated from the Fourth German Edition. (In three volumes.) London, 1846.

The Gospel History is essentially a history of miracle. It is true, that many of the events narrated in it, are, when taken by themselves, but natural occurrences; as, for example, the journeyings of Christ, his mere act of speaking, much that was done by his disciples, the part which the Jews acted, &c. But, then, we must not fail to ob-

Rationalist in the German sense; not one of us who does not consider the Scriptures a positive revelation." A few additional passages, or expressions, taken at random from Coquerel's work, will show how unfounded is this charge against him and his associates. "The inspired Word of God is the glorious text of our churches." Speaking of his work, he says it is designed to lead to thought, and by this to raise the mind to faith; "not by human thought left to itself, but by human thought resting on the Bible as a positive and direct revelation of the Spirit of God to the spirit of man." Alluding to the Protestant Church of Holland, he says, "the dangerous German metaphysical and critical infidelity has not followed the current of the Rhine, and flowed down into the midst of her schools: the still more dangerous infidelity of France, so light in its affected science, has not crossed the frontier; it stopped on this side of Belgium, and drew back before it could pass the wide heaths of Holland." Again: we "show to all, and request from all, an unfeigned request for every sincere conviction drawn from the Bible." "Every inspiration has been accompanied by objective proofs, proofs lying beyond the will and the reason of the inspired, viz: prophecy and miracles." "Miracles are proofs of divine commission," &c. Many other passages might be quoted; but these will suffice to show how utterly unfounded is the charge of Rationalism brought against our author and his fellow ministers. Though they may not be slaves to the mere letter, nothing is more manifest than their sincere and reverent faith in the miraculous revelations of the Bible.

Digitized by Google

serve that even these natural facts, as described in the narrative, are nevertheless underlaid with miracle, and receive their peculiar significance from their relation to miracle; we mean when taken in the connexion in which they are there presented. According to the Gospels, Jesus Christ was, from first to last, a miraculous personage. His life and his doings were of that character. He based his teachings primarily on special and positive authority from God, and enforced his religion on mankind by that sanction; of which sanction he professed to give full proof in his miracles. Though he occasionally illustrated particuliar truths and precepts, by referring to nature and providence, and though he sometimes appealed to the confirmation which reason and conscience intuitively gave to certain of his doctrines; yet, back of all these illustratives, he placed the grand fact that the words he spoke were not his, but those of the Father who sent him, and that he was God's commissioned agent and authorized spokesman to the world. This was the substratum on which he rested the whole. Of course, it underlaid every thing he did or taught, and gave character to every thing that was done for, or against, him and his gospel.

There is an oversight, to which men of a highly speculative turn, are liable, on this point. Accustomed to form their theories without scrupulous attention to facts, they are apt to fancy that the miraculous can be separated from the Gospel History, as a part by itself; and, that, after they have thus cast away all that is supernatural, (we mean in the common sense of this epithet,) the same Christ and the same religion will still remain unchanged in essence. This might, perhaps, be the case, had the character of Christ's ministry been entirely different from what it was: had he rested his gospel on philosophical abstractions, or on mere human intuitions, and not on the divine authority; and had the miraculous consisted only of here and there a disconnected act, like an outhanging appendage that might be cut off without touching the vital sources; or were it not indeed the very element that gave life, as well as form, to the whole. But according to the New Testament, Christianity itself was a miraculous dispensation from God. It was such as a whole. It was such, both in the manner of its introduction into the world, and in its

Digitized by Google

intrinsic nature, as well as in respect to the means by which it was substantiated. In the Gospel History, the miraculous is the primaryand essential element; the natural is but the circumstantial. For, the localities and all the merely human phenomena in the scene, might be changed, without vital injury; but to take away God's immediate agency and sanction, or the demonstrations thereof, would be fatal. Even were we to set aside this or that particular miracle, the Naturalist would gain nothing, except inconsistency, in the result; for the whole is so interfused, pervaded, and informed, with miracle, — Christ committed himself so thoroughly to his claim of miraculous power and immediate authority from God,— that we can no more extract this element, without destroying the system, and the character of its Founder also, than we can extract the vital principle from a body without producing death. No Galvanism, no scientific substitute, can be made, in either case, to operate well as a living power. We must accept the gospel as miraculous, in the common sense of this epithet, or else we must reject it downright. No other alternative is possible in the premises. It is, indeed, an easy thing to apply the same name to another religion, standing on wholly different grounds; we may easily fancy to ourselves another kind of Jesus Christ, exhausted of all immediate authority from God; we may do this, too, by the help of some suggestions borrowed from the New Testament, and accommodated to our scheme, as we might also accommodate select passages and sentiments to any other scheme. But all this would be only to play over the ancient trick of the Neoplatonists, who sought to foist in a new heathen religion under the ostensible sanction of the existing Polytheism, which they were the meanwhile trying covertly to displace. If the miracles in Christianity are impositions, the gospel, as Christ placed it, stands on common ground with the ancient mythological religions, and ought to be honestly discarded by us, as they, in their day, ought to have been openly discarded by their pretended advocates but secret enemies. What man, of common sense, ever supposed that the philosophical religion of the Neoplatonists, of the third and fourth centuries, was the same as the old fabulous Polytheism, for which they strove to make it pass among

Digitized by Google

the people? They thought to go back behind this, to an absolute religion, of which Polytheism was but a faint and distorted reflection; just as some of our modern speculatists think to go back behind Christianity, to an absolute religion, of their own discovering, of which Christ's gospel was but a reflection, obscured and perverted by a mass of fables. In both cases it is the supposed absolute religion, and not the alleged reflection, which is held. We should find no fault, here, on the ground of honesty, were it but held in its own name.

It is chiefly the miraculous character of the Gospel History, which has led modern unbelievers to impeach its general truth. The instinct of its foes, truer than that of some of its friends, has always guided them straight to what we have seen is one of the vital points of Christianity. It is here, therefore, that the attack must be met, if met at at all.

We do not, however, suppose it requisite that one should stop at every cavil, or even at every honestly-meant objection, against Christianity, and stand in suspense till it is searched to the bottom. We never do so, nor can we do so, with respect to any other important truth that we hold; and why should it be expected of us in reference to this one subject alone? A few prominent facts, or general principles, are commonly sufficient to show which way the decision must fall. In ordinary cases, the larger part of Christians probably feel no pressing need to inquire very far into the historical grounds on which the authenticity of the sacred record stands. They find, in the gospel itself as it is presented in the New Testament, such marks of truth as satisfy them of the whole at once; just as we find, in the idea of God, such a fulfilment of the demands of our religious nature, and such a correspondence with the apparent "reason of things," as to sustain our convictions, though we may never have inquired philosophically into the specific evidences of the divine existence, and though we may never need to do so, unless doubts that originate in criticism be intruded into our minds. Even when the Christian has occasion to go a step further in examining,—if he look into the New Testament, with a somewhat critical eye, to judge respecting the truth of the facts there recorded, the unmistakeable simplicity and

Digitized by Google

good-faith of the writers commend their narrative to his confidence. The obvious air of reality which prevades the whole, the suitableness of the deeds and events in their relation to such a character as Christ, and to the workings of such a religion as his, the decisive tests to which the more important facts were manifestly subjected at the time, — such *prima facie* considerations as these, usually settle the question, where there is not already a strong tendency to doubt. We suppose these are the grounds, consciously or unconsciously recognized, on which the great mass of considerate Christians receive the New Testament as unquestioned authority for its facts as well as for its abstract doctrines.

Nor is such belief to be stigmatized as blind faith. For, according to the supposition, it has been confirmed by an examination carried as far as examination is usually carried in other cases, and as far indeed as the exigence ordinarily demands. It rests, in the person's mind, on general reasons as definite and as well ascertained as those on which the common belief, say, in the past history of the world, reposes. Who, among us, has exhausted all the sources of historical criticism, and foreclosed all possible skepticism, with respect to the existence of the old Roman Empire? What do we absolutely know about it? Yet who calls belief in that fact, blind faith? If it be objected that we, here, seem to confound the credibility of miracles with that of mere natural events, we grant that the objection, though it mistakes the precise point of our argument, would still be in place were we now speaking of a thoroughly critical examination. But it does not apply to the state of mind we are at present considering. For it is just as natural to the unsophisticated mind to credit miracles in a revealed religion, as it is to credit extraordinary natural phenomena in the common order of providence. Only let the fact of a revelation be apparently true, and the alleged miracles suitable to it; and we do not, at first, feel any need of stronger testimony in this case than in the other. We repeat, then, that the common faith in Christianity rests on as wide a view of the evidence, as is thought necessary in respect to other important facts. Why do people rest so thoroughly assured that our forefathers came from Europe and settled at Plymouth? or that the

Digitized by Google

Revolutionary War took place? Not on any very critical investigation, especially of an historical kind, such as would become necessary were those events questioned till they seemed doubtful. And yet the common simple belief in them answers all the practical purposes, at present, that a more learned belief would serve.

So, too, in ordinary cases, a similar uncritical faith in the Christian revelation, suffices; and, for the same reason. But, now, let serious doubts be forced upon the Christian with respect to the authenticity of the gospel — we mean, of course, the gospel as Christ presented it; let the grounds on which it was placed, be impeached or ridiculed, till they shall seem to him uncertain or absurd; and then his mind has become changed from that state in which he could recognize the truth of the whole without any severe questioning. With this change, comes the necessity of some critical process of inquiry, such as he can carry out on the subject; just as he would be compelled to a similar course, on the occurrence of similar doubts with respect to other important matters. If his difficulties arise from criticism, be it his own or that of others, they can be removed only by criticism. In his new mood, it will not do for him to refuse this kind of examination, and to rely on a stubborn dogmatism. If he does, one of two things will be inevitable; either he will be harassed with doubts, which he tries in vain to suppress by the effort merely of his will,— his understanding being all the while skeptical; or else he will, unconsciously perhaps, compromise the matter, by relinquishing every thing on which his doubts have fastened, and then trying to make what is left answer as a substitute; in other words, by giving up the miraculous and primary element, and falling back on the philosophical, or speculative. He sacrifices the Christianity of the New Testament, and retains only some abstract principles which he has deduced from it, after his fashion. From "the bread of God that cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world," he distills, in such way as he can, its "essential oils" and "alcohols," and then stimulates with this boasted *aqua vitæ;* which has the same relation to the gospel of Jesus Christ, that gin and whiskey have to the bread-stuffs, from which they are extracted. We see many people, not otherwise want-

Digitized by Google

ing in discriminative acumen, who deceive themselves, in this respect, through the predominance of their imagination, and sometimes through an ambition to philosophize. They flatter themselves that they adroitly gain the victory over skepticism, by yielding to it every inch it disputes, and by retreating back upon some grounds of abstraction that are supposed to lie beyond its reach. It is enough to observe that this is not conquering skepticism, but being conquered by it, without even making a stand; it is the victory of capitulating and outrunning. But skepticism, if its history may be relied on, will eventually beat, even at this game. It will overtake; and the trial of speed can end only in complete surrender of all religious belief, whether Christian or Extra-Christian.

At the present time, when skepticism, or as it appears to us a somewhat ostentatious infidelity, has made an inroad into our own denomination, we think it seasonable to direct attention to the specific evidences of Christianity. To shut out all cavil, let it be remarked that, by Christianity, we mean no mere abstraction, whether of its spirit or of its theology, but the revelation which God gave through Jesus of Nazareth. Among the several departments of proof, we shall here look into what may be called the historical. We select this, because it lies at the bottom of the rest, as the fact itself always precedes, in the logical order, its developements; and because, on this account, it is usually the first to be attacked. A very condensed statement of the case, and of the necessary inferences, is all that we can hope to crowd into the space of an article.

Four general facts are admitted, we think, by every one who has looked into the matter, whether Christian or unbeliever: 1, That Jesus of Nazareth lived at the time and place specified by the Evangelists, that he was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and that he was the founder of the sect called Christians; 2, that his followers, the Christians, had become quite numerous within twenty or thirty years after his death, so that their societies were spread abroad, at so early a period, from Asia to Rome; 3, that their peculiar religious views, customs, and character, and also their treatment by the world, were, so far as we can discover, such as they are represented in the New Testament. These

Digitized by Google

three groups of facts, being sufficiently recognized by profane history, and acknowledged even by all skeptics of any repute, may be set down as fixed land-marks, with the bearings of which every thing else must coincide. To these three, we may now add the fourth admission, which is equally conceded on all hands, viz: That the Book of Acts, and the main body at least of the Epistles, in the New Testament, were written in the period to which they are usually assigned, and by those whose names they bear; in other words, that they are genuine, whether all their contents be true or not. This fourth fact stands not only on the strength of external evidence, but on certain vital relations within, which it would be impossible to counterfeit,—on undesigned coincidences between the book of Acts and the Epistles, which integrate them together, and at the same time demonstrate that they were composed amidst the circumstances to which they refer.

That part of the New Testament which the opposers of Christianity strive to set aside, as not genuine, and as the product of a later age, is the Four Gospels. The reason why they fix on these, is, that this is the part where the account of miracles is specific and detailed; and they feel it indispensable to get rid of such a quadruple series of testimony, so circumstantial, given with so evident honesty by eye-witnesses and contemporaries, and sent forth while the real facts were still so notorious both to friends and foes. Every unbeliever, who has considered the circumstances of the case, is aware that if we once allow the Gospels to have been written at the early date, and by the men, to whom they are ascribed, it becomes far more difficult for a rational thinker to question their historical truth in general, than to admit it, and to credit their account of miracles. All, therefore, is supposed to depend on making it appear that the record itself was not original, but the work of some subsequent period, when there had been time for a host of fables to grow up, and become incorporated with the traditional history to such an extent as to change it into the miraculous history we now have.

To us, this hypothesis appears to have been conceived only through oversight of a consideration which is at once fatal to it, viz: that the miraculous is not simply mixed with the history, as a subsequent addition, but is obvi-

Digitized by Google

ously the primary element out of which the rest was developed. A similar absurdity, in Geology, would be, to suppose that the fossiliferous strata were formed subsequently to the upper deposite, and then inserted somehow underneath it. To pass by this, however; we would observe that, even were the Four Gospels set aside, still the Gospel History, so far as its miraculous character is concerned, would be left standing in the unquestioned book of Acts and the Epistles. In this part of the New Testament, we do not indeed have the particulars detailed, but we have them presupposed. We have the general fact just as clearly recognized, here, as it is in the Gospels, that the apostles and first believers built their hopes on the miraculous character and doings of their Master, and that they convinced thousands, on the spot, by appealing to the public notoriety of "the signs and wonders" by which God approved Jesus, and sanctioned their own ministry. We confess, we never have been able to see what substantial advantage unbelievers can expect to gain in their premises, by denying the genuineness of the Four Gospels, so long as they let the rest of the New Testament remain. Nothing is plainer than that the latter involves, though in general terms, the very thing, length and breadth, which the former is sacrificed to get rid of. The book of Acts and the Epistles being genuine documents, the question now in hand is absolutely settled. We see, in them, that the miraculous history was, in fact, the original one; that the Christian testimony from the very first was, that Christ was sent of God with plenary authority, that he wrought numerous miracles in attestation of the divine sanction, and that after he was crucified he rose from the dead and appeared personally to his disciples and to "above five hundred brethren at once." We see, too, that the reality of his miracles was not then denied even by his enemies and opposers, the Jews.

Here, then, the question is closed, in respect to the originalness of our Gospel History; and we might, with propriety, proceed now to take the bearings of this fact. But we wish to say something on the genuineness of the Four Gospels, themselves, and to clear away some misapprehensions of the grounds on which it stands.

Digitized by Google

To get any distinct view of these grounds, we must first put aside one or two vulgar notions, that have been rather industriously spread, of late, though we do not recollect to have found them clearly proposed by any writer of repute among unbelievers. It is sometimes represented that the way in which our Four Gospels came to be received as the authentic record, was, that at some early period they were selected out of an accumulation of similar works, by some council, or by some ecclesiastical vote, or by some contrivance of influential persons, and that they were thus introduced to the acceptance of the Christian world, as the others would have been, had they happened to be selected. Now, all this is sheer fiction. There is not a trace of any thing like it in all antiquity, ecclesiastical, heretical, or profane. No one, acquainted with the matter, but knows that the state of the case excludes the supposal of any such factitious selection and adoption. The way in which the Four Gospels, as well as the other books of the New Testament, obtained universal authority in the Christian world, was somewhat like the way in which the Minutes of the Proceedings, say, of our Associations and Conventions, command confidence, as the genuine documents, among our brethren throughout the country. They were received, in the first place, from the writers themselves, under whose eye they circulated for a while; they were seen, by the surviving actors, to agree with what they themselves remembered of the extraordinary events; they were found, by all who paid attention to the matter, to be a statement of the same things that the apostles and their associates, and the early believers, had previously been in the practice of relating; every body who read them saw that they gave the same history which had already, in substance, been orally transmitted through the Christian world, and on which the Christian communities had arisen. As the authentic record of "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ," they were preserved, transcribed, circulated wherever there were Christians. They were read in the churches, already scattered over the world; were received by the children of the first generation, and so passed on to the next; were translated into other languages; appealed to, in the controversies that arose between different parties of Christians; quoted and

Digitized by Google

referred to, sometimes casually sometimes purposely, by successive writers. They were, everywhere and in every way, treated by the Christians, heretics as well as Orthodox, as the undisputed and peculiar documents of the Gospel History; and all this, for several ages, without their genuineness being ever questioned, by friend or foe, any more than is that of our public Statute-Books, at this day. Such was the manner in which they obtained universal acceptance among the Christians.

Another notion, of the same sort with the preceding, has been sometimes urged, namely, that the value of early testimony to the existence and common estimation of the Gospels at any given date, depends on the personal veracity, or sound judgment, of the writers adduced as witnesses. Nobody, however, who has looked into the matter, needs to be told that what we mean by "the testimony of early writers," is not their *affidavit* that such and such a book had existed for so long a time, &c., nor properly speaking, any simple *declaration* of theirs, as this notion would presuppose; but it is their appeal to the Gospels as the standard already well-known and acknowledged, their use of them as such, their interweaving of them in their own works, their recognition of them in various ways, designed and undesigned. We do not, for ourselves, suppose that the primitive fathers of the church were peculiarly wanting in veracity, though it must be acknowledged that they could go beyond fact, in their zeal for the cause; but until some way shall be discovered, in which a writer can actually use a book before it exists, it makes little difference, in such a case as we are considering, whether he is sure authority in all other matters, or not. We might, for instance, quote the "New Revelations" as irrefragable proof that the existence of the Bible as an authoritative book, at least "of the past," was known in the city of New York; and yet we might not think the writer, or rather the lecturer, to be a credible witness for many things that he positively *asserts*.

We have already seen that there is no occasion to inquire farther, in order to verify the originalness of the Gospel History, in general. It is recognized in the contemporary Acts and Epistles. Let us, however, ask, What is the

Digitized by Google

state of the case with respect to the genuineness of the Four Gospels?

The answer in short is this: that all the direct historical evidence which we find, is, without exception, for it; and that this is much stronger and more abundant than can be adduced for the authorship of any book written in ancient times, except the New Testament. The objections and doubts that have been raised with respect to it, are founded on such criticisms as would bear equally against the genuineness of every historical production, modern as well as ancient. We suppose that this may seem a one-sided statement to those who have only looked at the host of alleged difficulties, without ascertaining their real character; but it will be found rather a moderate summing up of the case, on thorough and candid examination. The fact is, that even writers in defence of the Gospels do not themselves seem to be aware how surpassingly strong their case is; we mean, if compared with that of other works. In seeking for complete demonstration, they forget how much scantier are the grounds on which the universal faith of mankind reposes, and justly reposes, with respect to authorship. Let them put any other book into the crucible; and then see how that will come out! The experiment would help them to the practical rule by which credibility, in such subjects, is measured.

If we begin at the end of the second century, when every body acknowledges that our Four Gospels were universally regarded as they now are,— if, from this date, we go back, decade by decade, we find them at each step, in general use among Christians of widely distant countries, and of hostile parties, till we reach the time of the apostles themselves; who will not be suspected of conniving at a forgery in their own name. It should be observed, too, that, in all this period, there is not a space where a spurious Gospel could have been silently foisted into such universal acceptance, any more than a Mesmeric Revelation concerning Christ's ministry could, this year, be foisted into our canon, amidst the watchful jealousies of our conflicting sects, and be spontaneously received at once, in all lands, and in all churches, as the sacred authority. It is true, that some of the most learned among the recent German theologians have tried to make it appear that our

Digitized by Google

Four Gospels were not in general use, till towards A. D. 200. But such is their mis-statement of facts, as well as misrepresentation of their bearings, so point-blank are their own self-contradictions, so absurd their gratuitous hypotheses, and so little of practical common-sense is there in their hypercritical arguments, that we cannot think it necessary to hunt down mere vapors. If any indiscriminating admirer of German criticism suspect that we have characterized these speculations by too contemptuous a term, let him read Prof. Norton's work, quoted at the head of this article; or, better still, let him, if he have the means, examine the Christian writings themselves of the second century. Tertullian, (A. D. 200,) a Latin writer at Carthage in Africa, and at Rome; the Greek writers, Clement of Alexandria, (A. D. 196,) in Egypt, Palestine and Syria; Irenæus, (A. D. 180,) in Asia Minor, and at Lyons, in France; Theophilus, (A. D. 180,) at Antioch, where "the disciples were first called Christians;" Athenagoras, (A. D. 178,) at Athens; the heathen philosopher Celsus, (A. D. 176,) who attacked Christianity, and alleged the discrepancies in the Four Gospels; Tatian, (A. D. 170,) at Rome, who composed a Diatessaron of the Four Gospels; Justin Martyr, (A. D. 150,) in Palestine, and at Rome;—if their manifold, aud often circumstantial, recognitions of the Four Gospels as the authoritative documents acknowledged by the whole Christian world, can be set aside, or even rendered doubtful, in the mass, there is nothing sure in past history. Even the testimony of Justin Martyr himself, whose references have been questioned the most desperately, comes out the clearer for the ordeal, and proves sufficient, though it were taken alone, to place the matter beyond doubt. After Prof. Norton's thorough and common-sense presentation of his case, it is hardly supposable that there can be any more dispute, among scholars, with respect to it.

Perhaps it will here be asked, But does it not appear, that, while our Four Gospels were indeed in use at this early date, there were spurious works likewise in use, either by the Christians in general, or by some part of them? The fact, briefly stated, is this: there were spurious works (not Gospels however,) in circulation; but they were evidently not regarded as belonging to the same cat-

Digitized by Google

egory with the books of the New Testament, nor were they supposed to have been derived, like them, from the apostles, or first Christians; nor does it appear that any other professed Gospel than ours, that is, any other professed history of Christ's life and ministry, was received even by a single sect, heretic or Orthodox. The fabulous works, now extant, of the latter kind, were of much later origin, and, it seems, were never held, in any age, as authentic, and were never in general circulation. The Gospels always stood as unrivalled in the Christian confidence, as they now do.

The only period that we need to consider particularly, is the one reaching from Justin Martyr, say A. D. 150, back to the age of the apostles themselves, about A. D. 90. Here are fifty or sixty years, from which few Christian writings, except St. John's, have descended to us; the whole of them together forming a volume not so large as the New Testament. As the remains are so scanty, the interval has been fixed upon as a blank that afforded a chance for the supposed manufacture and general introduction of our Gospels, without leaving any trace of the convulsion which must have attended. To us, however, the hypothesis itself appears to involve a moral impossibility, aside from the facts that directly disprove it. How could a new, and till then unheard-of, set of such fabrications be taken for the original documents, by the discordant Jewish and Gentile churches, and other Christian parties, throughout the whole known world, where collusion was impracticable? Having no previous existence, and consequently no established authority, how could they be accepted *gratuitously* by all, as the genuine and decisive record, when the very tenor of the documents, or Gospels, was such that some of the sects, especially the Gnostics, were driven to the most violent and absurd methods of interpretation, in order to make them seem reconcilable with their Oriental fancies? It would be, as if our Orthodox churches should now adopt the Book of Mormon as sacred, just for the pleasure of devising some queer explanation that should seem to ward off its adverse meaning from their doctrine. This problem must be solved, some way, before the hypothesis can be rationally proposed. We say hypothesis; for it does not claim to be any thing else, and is not coun-

Digitized by Google

tenanced by a known fact, nor by an intimation in history. The facts all bear the other way. They are comprized, so far as we recollect them, in the three following statements.

1. The book of Acts being confessedly genuine, the Gospel of Luke is carried back, at once, to a date still earlier than we have designated; for it is mentioned in the beginning of that work, as a "former" treatise by the same author: "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up," &c. (Acts i. 1, 2. Compare this, with the first verses of Luke.) From the unfinished state in which the narrative in Acts is broken off, leaving St. Paul in prison at Rome, A. D. 62, it is evident that this is the date of the book. The Gospel, "the former treatise," had already been written, and sent to Theophilus. Here is an autographic verification of the genuineness of Luke's Gospel.

2. Papias, who wrote, in the central part of Asia Minor, about A. D. 116, mentions the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, by name, for the purpose of giving a traditional account of the manner in which they were said to have been composed by those two persons. The tenor of his language shows that these two Gospels were, at that time, held not only as genuine, but as sacred. Again: the works of the Apostolical Fathers, as the few Christian writings of this period are called, recognize the Gospel History; and they also appear to borrow expressions and thoughts from each of our Four Gospels, though their quotations, if isolated from all other considerations, are seldom distinct and full enough to determine their reference with certainty. We find allusions, however, in each of them: in the Shepherd of Hermas, written at Rome, A. D. 150; in the Epistle of Barnabas, probably of Alexandria, about A. D. 135; in the Epistle of Polycarp of Smyrna, A. D. 117; in the Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch, A. D. 116, (if these last be not a forgery;) and in the Epistle of Clement of Rome, A. D. 96. We have already observed that all these writings, put together, are rather meagre, not making so large a volume as the New Testament.

3. Another chain of facts, which reaches back to the middle of this period, has been recently laid bare, (see

Digitized by Google

Hug and Norton,) with a thoroughness that leaves little chance for any important mistake. The Gnostic Christians, or heretics, who began to appear, and to cause trouble, even in the time of St. Paul and St. John, were gathered into sects, violently hostile to the regular churches, as early as A. D. 120, and onwards. It is found that even they, opposers as they were from the beginning, retained our Gospels as the authentic history, and as the only written history, of Christ's life and ministry; though their doctrine, a prodigious system of monstrous phantasms, was contradicted, in almost every vital point, by the plain tenor of those documents. They were obliged to resort to desperate explanations, to the pretence of a supplementary tradition secretly handed down from the apostles, &c., to sustain their theories against the simple Gospel narratives, which they still held as sacred. Since they had every motive which contrariety of sentiments could prompt, to reject them, the nature of the case shows that the only reason why they retained them, at such disadvantage, was, necessity; that there was no other account in circulation; that they could not discard them without discarding the notorious facts of Christianity, and thus depriving themselves of the last pretence to hold the name. The Gospels must have been, at that time, so unquestioned as to their origin, so deeply fixed in the confidence of the whole Christian world, that every one, heretic or Orthodox, who assumed the Christian profession, was obliged, for the sake of consistency, to receive them as the standard, at whatsoever cost of violent and absurd interpretation. The Basilidians, who were embodied in a sect about A. D. 120, and the Valentinians, (about A. D. 130,) made as much use of the Four Gospels, as did the Orthodox Christians. It was not till about A. D. 140, that the Marcionites were gathered, who retained only a mutilated copy of Luke's Gospel, and rejected the rest; not, however, because they doubted their genuineness, or their account of miracles, — both of which they acknowledged; but because, as they alleged, the apostles who wrote and approved the books, were under Jewish influences. — We have said that these traces reach back to the middle of this period, or to the year 120. Properly speaking, they carry us back to the very beginning. For the Gnostics arose in the time of the apostles; and as they

Digitized by Google

never sympathized with the regular churches, they must have known and used the Gospels from the first, or they would not afterwards have adhered to them, to their great inconvenience.

These, we think, are all the important facts, belonging to the case, in this period. Whoever will put them together, will see that they are, of themselves, conclusive; especially, as there are no facts of a contrary bearing. And if we then look at them in connexion with what we have shown, that the Gospel History was at least the original one; if we view them also in their proper relation to the known circumstances of the Christian world at that period, and consider that the Christians, from A. D. 60 onwards, were spread over all the East, and then over the known world; that there were inveterate prejudices, growing more and more violent, between the Jewish and Gentile converts, and direct hostilities between the Gnostics and the rest; that the Gentiles were naturally jealous of accepting books in the name of Jewish writers, and the Gnostics far more so; if we take into consideration the impossibility, in this general state of things, of a universal conspiracy to receive as sacred a set of newly fabricated documents that were so adverse to many of the leaders themselves, we shall find that the question as to the genuineness of our Four Gospels is absolutely closed up,—all gratuitous hypotheses to the contrary notwithstanding.

We do not suppose it needful, in ordinary cases, to go into so exhaustive an historical examination of this point. The very character of the Gospels carries, to an unsophisticated mind, a warrant of their genuineness. But, as we have observed, when the mind has been changed from that state by the intrusion of critical doubts, it becomes necessary to let criticism "have its perfect work." We have, therefore, endeavored to give the results, in a summary statement which no fair enumeration of particulars, more detailed, could materially affect.

Taking, then, the history, contained in the Four Gospels and in Acts, to be the original one, and these books themselves to have been written as they purport, the inferences will be at once anticipated by all who have thought soberly on the matter. In stating them, we shall only

Digitized by Google

repeat, in our homely way, what has often been said by others. But if there be any of our readers, to whom the subject is new, we beg them to see carefully to two things, as we go along: 1, to the facts we lay down, — whether they are such; and 2, to the conclusions we draw, — whether they necessarily, unavoidably, follow from those facts. It may, perhaps, be asked by some, "What if the Gospels were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? and the Acts by Luke? Does that make their stories true? Who knows they were inspired?" Now, let us be distinctly understood: For the present, we leave the inspiration and divine authority of these books wholly out of the question; we are to bring our proof only from what every body, infidel as well as Christian, knows to be fact.

It is a fact, that these books give a very circumstantial account (true or false, just which we please,) of Christ; of the time when he lived; of the places in which he was, on various occasions; and of the people among whom he acted; of his teaching certain doctrines; of his being, in consequence, hated and persecuted by the chief men of his nation; of his working miracles, healing the sick, lame and blind, before the face of his enemies, and at a number of places, mentioned by name, in Galilee, and at Jerusalem; of his raising dead persons, also named, at Bethany, Nain, Capernaum, — all in presence of the Jews; and of the confessions which his enemies made, among themselves, that "this man wrought many miracles." These books give an account of his being at length taken by the priests, &c., arraigned, first pronounced innocent by Pilate, but finally condemned at the solicitation of the exasperated Jews, crucified in the face of all Jerusalem, buried, his sepulchre sealed, and then watched by the Governor's guards; they relate his resurrection, mention the day and the hour, and the circumstances that followed; his intercourse with the disciples for forty days afterwards; his commission to the apostles, &c. The book of Acts gives an account (true or false,) of the early ministry of these apostles, stating that they preached these very facts all over the country, and in the places where they were declared to have occurred; that such preaching made thousands of converts, on the spot; that these preachers

Digitized by Google

suffered every thing in their ministry, — some of them even death itself, which indeed all of them expected to suffer; but that nothing could silence them, for they counted not their lives dear unto themselves, that they might testify of the things they knew, and proclaim Jesus and his resurrection.

Now, we know that these books contain such accounts, and that the Epistles in the New Testament also recognize them. "Yes; but," it may be asked, "what of that?" We will see. There are some inferences that reason must draw, in the case, whether we are willing or not. And, here, let us observe that it is the office of reason to take the bearings of facts, and to see what they signify, in their mutual relations. The brutes know a great many facts as well as we do; the difference is, that they cannot reason from them, at least so well as we can. A horse, a dog, a monkey, had they our language, might be made to know that we have these books and these accounts; but they could not, even then, put them in their proper connexion with other things, and deduce their significance, because they lack our reason. So, if we contrive to lay aside our reason, we shall see nothing beyond the bare facts; but if we reason upon them, we shall draw some conclusions. The first conclusion is, that they, who wrote these accounts, did certainly know whether they were, in general, true, or false. Matthew, a personal attendant, either knew that Jesus healed the lame, blind, and sick, and raised the dead, as he relates, or else he knew that he did not. There was no *mistake* as to the matter, any more than there is as to our seeing men walk the streets. Both he and John knew what the facts were, just as well as we know whether we have seen our neighbors raise the dead. They knew that they saw Jesus after his resurrection, and that they conversed with him, as they state, or they knew that no such interviews took place. And so, of all the apostles. What they recorded and preached, was matter of notorious fact, or else a fabrication of their own, made up wilfully, — a falsehood which they knowingly devised with the purpose of deceiving, in the name of God; a series of the most impious falsehoods ever uttered and adhered to. There is no middle ground in a case so circumstantial and detailed as theirs. Reason must take one or the other alternative.

Digitized by Google

"Well, who knows but that they meant to deceive, as others have done? Who knows but that they were designing impostors?" Here, we begin to come in sight of the difficulties that rise up, like mountains, to bar in the way of the unbeliever. For nobody who sits down to think soberly on the subject, can ever persuade himself that the writers of the New Testament were such thoroughgoing cheats. He may, perhaps, think them weak, though honest; but whoever reads the Gospels and Epistles, feels at once that these are not the words of artful deceivers. We may rest the matter on the moral sense of every one. It does rest here, in the minds of all reflecting persons. We have never read, nor heard of, an infidel writer, of any repute, who did not acknowledge that the apostles were good men, though credulous. This is the first difficulty; in order to deny the substantial truth of the Gospel narrative, we must conclude that the writers of these books, and the original preachers of this religion, were among the most accomplished, as well as successful, knaves that ever lived; that they first got up a new religion on falsehood, and then carried it out by determined lying. This alternative, reason will never accept.

Let this pass, however. Here stands another difficulty to close up our way in that direction. The facts recorded are set down in such a manner, described with such particularity of circumstance, name, time and place, that every body, in all that country, would immediately know whether they were true. Not only the apostles, but hundreds in Jerusalem, knew whether Christ healed the man born blind, whose story St. John has given at large, and whether Peter and John restored the cripple at the gate of the temple. The Jews of Bethany knew whether Christ raised Lazarus, as here related; those of Nain, whether he raised the widow's son; those in other places, whether he there performed miracles as alleged. The Pharisees knew whether they themselves had been forced to admit the reality of his miracles, and had confessed their alarm and embarrassment at the deep impression thus made on the whole community. It was to these eye-witnesses, and to the conscious public, that the apostles first preached, solemnly appealing to their own knowledge of the facts, and resting their cause on that ground. Now, nothing is more

Digitized by Google

plainly absurd, than to suppose that any men, in their senses, would choose wantonly to set their cause afloat on mere fabrications of this kind; we mean among the very opposers, who knew the impudent falsehood of the story, and who would thereby sink the whole scheme, at once, as easily as we break a bubble. This is not the way in which impostors proceed, or in which they can be made to proceed. Get, if we can, half a dozen Universalist preachers to go into Boston, next Sunday, and there, in imitation of the apostles, plead for their doctrine, before a vast concourse of Calvinists, on the ground that God has openly sanctioned it, by miracles he has wrought among them through Mr. Ballou, as they themselves all know! It is true, if Mr. Ballou — (pardon the supposition!) had actually performed the miracles among them, this is the argument the preachers would certainly use; but, as the case is, none could be insane enough thus to commit their cause to sure destruction. Or get, if we can, the leading Universalists to publish, next week, a series of documents, as the authority for their religion, stating that when Mr. Ballou removed to Boston, some thirty years ago, he gave sight to a blind man in Park-street church, amidst several Calvinistic clergymen, deacons, and the congregation; that he raised a dead man to life in Cambridgeport, another in Northampton, and a young lady in Springfield,— all in presence of a number of Calvinists; that he was universally known to have performed numerous miracles; and representing moreover, in imitation of Acts, that our ministers have been, ever since, in the practice of publicly insisting on these divine manifestations as the support of their faith, and that it was by the notoriety of them that Universalism made its rapid conquests!—The fact is, reason will decide that the Evangelists and apostles were, not stupid indeed, but madder than the inmates of a Lunatic Hospital, to send forth their accounts, if they did not know them to be undeniable truth. Nor is this all. The Jews themselves were also struck with utter madness, to be converted, in thousands, by such declarations, on the very spot where the whole was absolutely known to be an outrageous falsehood. There was a miracle, of some kind, wrought either by God, or by the Devil. Either the facts alleged were true,— in which case, all parties acted

Digitized by Google

according to the laws of human nature; or else the apostles and the whole country were, all at once, taken with a permanent fit of universal insanity. It is for reason to decide which alternative to adopt.

There is another consideration. The Evangelists and apostles had to overcome every worldly motive in order to bear their testimony, whether by writing or by preaching. They knew that want, contempt, hardship, danger, persecution, and even death, were the sole earthly consequences; and still they braved all. Now, reason must find a motive for their conduct. If they were honest men, and knew their testimony to be true, they acted as earnest and sincere men would always act under such a consciousness. Let them but know that they have God's truth to declare, and they will speak, though death stand in the way. They cannot keep silence; and as for danger,— they feel that God is with them, and what is there that they can fear? But would any set of men, how reckless so ever, conspire in a vast enterprize of falsehood, and sacrifice themselves to it, knowing beforehand that the only terms of the service, were, self-denial and abandonment of all earthly hopes?

We need not multiply considerations. It is enough to observe, that, whatsoever way it turns, unbelief runs immediately into absurdity, and to avoid a miracle of God's working, resorts to an enchantment of the Devil's! We might have stopped when we rested the question on the simplicity and good-faith, so manifest, so undeniable, in the writings of the New Testament; and, in closing our presentation of the case, we would return to that position, and leave the matter there.

It will be remembered that the direct chain of historical evidence, as we have now presented it, forms but one department of the proof of the genuineness of the Gospels, and of the truth of their narratives. It is, however, the department which naturally comes first, in any critical examination, and which lies at the bottom of all the rest.

H. B. 2d.

Digitized by Google

Art. XIV.

Mont Blanc and the Alps.

Vacation Rambles and Thoughts; comprising the Recollections of three Continental Tours. By T. Noon Talfourd, D. C. L. London: Edward Moxon. 12 mo. pp. 337.

The Alps and the Rhine; a Series of Sketches by J. T. Headly. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 12 mo. pp. 138.

The Pilgrim in the Shadow of the Jungfrau Alp. By George B. Cheever, D. D. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 12 mo. pp. 214.

That the reading public are ignorant of the wonderful character and scale of Alpine scenery, is no fault of the many travellers who visit it. With commendable spirit they have multiplied books on the subject, and undoubtedly done their best to give us a just and clear conception of the varied beauty, and awful sublimity of these mountain regions of perpetual snow,— death-dealing avalanches, and wild gorges, whose very mention strikes terror to the heart.

But somehow, we rise with a feeling of disappointment from the perusal of books of travel. They awaken our curiosity more than they satisfy it. We feel that they might have done better. Perhaps we are at fault, by the structure of our nature. It may be, that the subject so far transcends human powers of description, that any attempt, even that of the most gifted pen, must necessarily prove a failure. The mind is overwhelmed by the grandeur presented to its view; its power of adequate representation is crushed by the weight of its emotions; it cannot find words to embody and state impressions so deep; it may muse over them in silence; it may store them away as treasures, in the inmost deep of memory, but it feels how futile is any attempt to drag them forth to light. We can fully appreciate this feeling; for the emotions, which the mountain scenery of New-Hampshire awakens in our minds, are all too deep, and of too complex a charecter,

Digitized by Google

to be portrayed on paper: — though nearly every peak, and gorge, are familiar to our mind's eye, yet we would not dare attempt the task of describing their appearance. To be thoroughly appreciated, they must be seen. Nature allows us to carry away impressions for our own gratification, but none for distribution. She claims individual homage as the price of her gift.

We are disposed, therefore, to be charitable towards those who attempt the greater task of painting in words the sublimities of the Alps. Their work, in the very nature of things, must be imperfect. But we submit that this is no excuse for obtruding miserable cant, either religious or political, upon unsuspecting readers; it has more fitting places for utterance in the conventicle and caucus room. Especially is Mr. Cheever's book deformed by his continued attemps to find analogies in the outward world, for the absurdities of his creed. It should seem that his main purpose of travel is to hunt up physical correspondences for the five points of Calvinism. He cannot gaze upon a muddy stream, but it brings him to discourse of total depravity; and, to make his metaphor consistent, he likens it, after its purification, to a Christian. In speaking of the Rhone, he says, —

"The river runs into the Lake at Villeneuve, and out of it at Geneva; though why the radiant sparkling stream, that issues with such swiftness and beauty, should bear the same name with the torrent of mud that rolls into it, it is difficult to say. Nevertheless, a Christian bears the same name after his conversion that he did before; and the new and beautiful characteristics of this river, when it rushes from the lake at the republican and Protestant end of it, might well remind you of the change, which takes place between the character of a depraved man, and a regenerated child of God. So in our native, graceless depravity. It is only by flowing into the chrystal Lake of Divine Love, that we leave our native impurities all behind us, on the shore of the world, and then when we reappear, when we flow forth again from this blessed Baptism, we are like the azure, arrowy Rhone, reflecting the hues of heaven." (p. 9.)

This is a fair sample of the style of his whole book. He is perpetually finding "sermons in stones;" but alas, they are all Orthodox sermons. He can never forget his profession; every scene, and event, must be improved upon, as

Digitized by Google

though he were addressing a congregation of unbelievers. We think such writing in bad taste, to say nothing of the false imagery he employs; and notwithstanding the Dr. thinks this the best feature of his book, and wishes he had given us more of the "same sort," we must still deem it out of place, and regard it as betraying a narrow and conceited mind. The business of the writer, on such a subject as his book professes to treat, is, to state facts: to give, so far as he is able, a just and clear picture of these wonderful works of God; it is the reader's privilege to draw from them their moral teachings; and these, we well know, will be different, to different minds. Where the Dr. finds emblems of total depravity, a mind trained in a more liberal philosophy than his, might discover that which suggested a soul, whose native purity had been defiled by spiritual pride, and bigotry; and which needed to expand beyond the narrow channel in which it runs, and to mingle more with its kind, deposite its impurities, and issue out again, as an emblem of charity and benevolence. And how could any mind but Dr. Cheever's, think of finding an emblem of Jonathan Edwards, in a tall and shining glacier, lifting its form high up among the clouds, the "parent of perpetual streams"? Had it been a volcano about which he was writing, there had been some consistency in his figure; as it is, we think it singularly inappropriate. However, he has given us some glimpses of grandeur and beauty; but his pictures are better colored, than drawn; a true artist might do much with the material he has collected; but taken as a whole, they are sadly deficient in perspective and in general outline.

Of Mr. Headly's book we can say but little. It is not, we are sorry to say, entirely free from affectation and cant. The conviction was forced upon us, while reading it, in connexion with Mr. Cheever's, that clergymen were not the best hands at sketching the beauties or the sublimities of nature. They are prone to moralize, and to sermonize: for facts they give reflections—all very well in their way, but leaving us altogether in the dark in regard to those things we desire to know. In justice, however, we must say, that Mr. Headly's book is less objectionable in this respect than Mr. Cheever's. There are fewer sermons, and more facts; but yet his standing metaphors for beauty, and ter-

Digitized by Google

ror, are heaven and hell; many of his best sentences are thus disfigured; which, together with an attempt here and there at *very* fine writing, gives his book an air of affectation which is far from being pleasant. Many of his sketches are bold, and show a strong hand; but he has no talent for grouping his pictures; they are scattered about in the direst confusion, and defy all attempts to give them harmony and unity. They are like the parts of several dissected pictures; not being made with reference to each other, it is impossible to bring them into position where a complete idea of the whole can be given. No one, from reading Mr. Headly's book, by itself, can form anything like a symmetrical idea of the appearance of the Alps. His mind will retain some impressions of grandeur, and of beauty, but like the pictures seen in dreams, they will leave no definite form, to be recalled in waking moments.

The book by Mr. Talfourd, as might be expected, is of a different character. He writes like a poet and an artist. There is no cant, no twaddle; but he seems to take the reader by the hand, and in a most confidential, loving tone, relates the varied incidents and picturesque grandeur, and awful sublimity, of the regions through which he passed. His book will repay a perusal. We recommend it as a model to those who write sketches of natural scenery. It has all the interest of a highly-wrought romance, and yet, there is no apparent straining after effect, such as disfigures Mr. Headly's style; — you seem to be a companion of his journey; to see the wonders in common; enter into all his feelings; get provoked at his disappointments as though they were your own; speculate with him upon the chances of a good dinner, and enjoy it together with him when procured.

Mr. Talfourd is a genuine Englishman in one respect; he looks after the interests of his stomach first; gazing at waterfalls and avalanches, climbing mountain gorges and glaciers, are secondary affairs. We can readily forgive, what to some may seem a blemish in his book, his constant reference to his bill of fare, when we witness the artlessness with which it is done, and realize that he is writing for brother Englishmen, who before attempting any journey, must first know where the best food and drink are to be had.

Digitized by Google

We have in his book the record of three tours. The first contains a brief sketch of France as seen from the Seine, from its mouth to Paris. From thence he departed for Switzerland, by way of Dijon to Geneva. Judging from his descriptions, we should say that this was the least interesting route that he could have chosen. Between Paris and Geneva, there is little or nothing to interest the traveller; but once there, a new world opens upon him. Perhaps we should except, in this remark, the assent and passage of the Jura ranges, which here form the natural eastern bulwark of France. They are traversed here by a great road, one of the works of Napoleon, which will render his name immortal, when the recollection of his battles shall have faded from the human mind. The view from the top of the Jura, comprises Lake Leman, Geneva, and Mont Blanc; but it is rare that the traveller is favored with the whole view. The mists that rise from the Lake, and from the valley of the Rhone, generally obstruct the vision.

Geneva has much of an historic nature, aside from its natural advantages of scenery, which renders it an object of interest. It was here that Calvin framed his stern theological system and dealt out damnation with an unsparing hand; here that he procured the death of Servetus. Here Rousseau was born, and here in after life he retired and sent out to the nations the wonderful creations of his genius, "which shook the forms and oppressions of the world." Here Voltaire lived in almost regal state, and "received the embassies of kings." It was here that Gibbon finished his history of Rome's downfall; a work which has done more than any other to shake the faith of men in Christianity, but which is now powerless to this end; happily its sophistries have been clearly pointed out. Here too, is the Castle of Chillon, rendered immortal by the pen of Byron: would he had written nothing worse than this beautiful tale.

Travellers for Mont Blanc, leave Geneva by the Port Rive; from thence to Savoy, where they strike the banks of the Arve, a turbulent and muddy stream, which rises among the glaciers of Mont Blanc, and empties into the Rhone. The scenery from thence to Bonneville is grand and beautiful. "The mounted outworks of the Mole rose

Digitized by Google

on one side, and the Salève declined on the other, showing the vast slope from the summit of the Great Salève, the dark crags of the Brezon rose before us; and while these grew more definite and prodigious, the snowy tops of the Alps peeped as if out of heaven directly before us." (Talfourd, p. 55.) Between Bonneville and Chamouni is the pass of Cluses; one of the most beautiful in all the Alps. It lacks the stern and terrific grandeur of the Via Mala, and the Splügen; but compensates by the richness and variety of its verdure. Its fall of water, the Nant d' Arpenaz, is second only to the celebrated Staubbach fall, of which we will speak by and by.

It is at Chamouni, that Mont Blanc, the monarch of European mountains, is seen in all its glory. Unlike most mountains, it is not a part of a range; it stands alone, as if scorning the aid and support of its kind. Rising abruptly from the valley to a height 15,665 feet, the base occupies the entire side, at least twelve miles in length. Mr. Talfourd thus describes it:

"Thus from the root to the summit, and from end to end, the snowy-wreathed mountain is seen at a glance; and nothing else. It seems to begin and end with the valley. There is nothing like it; nothing to suggest that it is a part of a chain of Alps; no other icy tops peer over its lower ridges to carry the mind beyond what the eye embraces; it is "itself alone." Although a forest of dark firs clothes its foundations, and extends irregularly to a considerable elevation, before it meets the snow, the glaciers descend so low as directly to connect the very floor of the valley with the frozen regions, and heighten the magical effect of contrast between the mountain and all around it. Between the two greatest of these, the Glacier Bossons and the Mer de Glace, the summit is enthroned; cast majestically a little back from the average line, round and perfectly white, and cresting a region curtained with snow, scarcely broken, except by the dark rocks, called the Grand Mulets, which stand out above midway, resembling in form attic windows in a steep house-roof; whence the stainless curtain seems to float down, with careless grace, toward the valley. A little on one side of the summit, and just below it, is the Dôme du Goutè, a much larger and grander dome than the summit itself; and beside it, huge splintered pinnacles, called *aiguilles*, spotted only with snow, seem to pierce the steep azure of the sky. The range of *aiguilles* and domes extends to the extremities of the valley, broken chiefly by the glacier called the Mer de Glace,

Digitized by Google

which is the icy floor of a deep valley winding in the midst of the mountain, and penetrating its inmost recesses. The masses of dazzling snow presented to the eye are so huge, that the mind, even here, only realizes the height of the mountain by a great effort — if it indeed realizes it at all; so that there are many mountains not half the height, which appear loftier; but I have seen none that, to my apprehension, approaches it in the combination of massive power, and almost celestial purity." (pp. 63, 64.)

The sight of such an exhibition of creative power as is thus displayed, it seems to us, would well repay the toils incident to the journey thither. It must be a proud moment in the life of a man, when for the first time he gazes upon the majestic form of this mountain king. From the valley, it is impossible to comprehend the magnitude or height of Mont Blanc; to see it in all its proportions, one must ascend to the top of Mont Breven, which directly fronts the highest point of Blanc. Here at an elevation of 8000 feet, the eye is enabled to scan the huge proportions of the upper and lower half, and realizes for the first time the immense height of this "watch-tower of time."

The appearance of the mountain at clear sunset is beautiful beyond description, if we may believe those who have looked upon it at that hour. From its top the sun bids good-night to Europe. He lingers around and upon the summit of the mountain, as though loath to hide his face from a friend; and when necessity bids him begone, as if to make some compensation for leaving it in darkness, he sheds the richest of his glories upon it, rendering the moments of his departure more beautiful than his stay; witness the following:

"The sun had set to me, but Mont Blanc was still looking down on his retiring light. And now over all its white form spread a pale rose-color, deepening gradually into a pink — the peaks around taking the same ruddy glow, while the giant shadows stretched their mis-shapen, black proportions over the vast snow-fields between. There they stand, a mass of rose-colored snow-mountains, towering away in the heavens: they had suddenly lost their massive strength and weight, and light as frost-work, and apparently transparent as a rose-tinted shell, they seemed the fit home of spiritual beings. There was none of the life and motion of flashing sunbeams; none of the glitter of light itself on mountain

Digitized by Google

summits, but a deep quiet that seemed almost holy, resting there, as if that rose-tinted top was bathed in the mellow radiance that one might dream of as belonging to a sunset in heaven. My eye wandered down the now etherial form of Mont Blanc till it rested on a wreath of fir-trees, whose deep green contrasted strangely with that pure rose-color. I stood bewildered,—it seemed a magic land. But the glorious vision, like all beauty, was as transient as the hour that gave it birth. Fainter and fainter again grew the tints till all passed away, and Mont Blanc stood white and cold and ghost-like, against the evening sky. This was more than I expected to see, and what few travellers *do* see. Mont Blanc is charry of such exhibitions of himself." (Headly, pp. 11, 12.)

We think Mr. Headly mistaken in this last particular. Most of those who have seen Mont Blanc mention similar scens to this with which he was favored. Not unlike it was the experience of Mr. Talfourd, as we gather from the following.

"We were abrubtly summoned by the principle *garçon* to the windows to look at Mont Blanc; and saw the most beautiful sight which ever met my eyes — the long ridges of the central mountain, clad in light of pale rose-color, which changed to saffron, and then melted into the cold gray light of a common evening."—(pp. 66, 67.) We can readily account for the unusual brevity of Mr. Talfourd, when we consider that he was called away from his dinner to witness this scene of beauty; his mind was lingering among the bounties of the *table de hote*, and consequently not in the best condition to receive deep impressions, or to meditate at length upon the scene.

The ascent of Mont Blanc has always been regarded, both by travellers and by the inhabitants of the valley, as a feat of great peril and importance. Of the hundreds whose ambition has soared so high, few have the requisite nerve to brave the dangers, or strength sufficient to bear the fatigue, incident to the journey. Indeed, the greater portion of those who have reached the summit, have been carried, or dragged up the last ascent by the sturdy guides; and then, such were their fatigue and intense suffering from the blinding glare of the snow, and rarity of the atmosphere, that they have been almost unable to avail themselves of the most glorious view ever opened to the

Digitized by Google

eyes of man. With a few, it has been different; and such are the accounts they have given of the extent and awful grandeur of the scene, that it is enough to inspire one with courage to attempt the ascent, though the chances of being in like manner favored are small.

The ascent of Mont Blanc was looked upon as an impossible feat by the inhabitants of Chamouni, until the year 1786. Previous to this, however, the attempt had been made upon several occasions; as far back as 1762, parties had set out with every facility for the accomplishment of the undertaking, but were driven back by the avalanches, and the awful chasms of ice that opened in their path. It is said that during this time the way to the top was accidentally discovered by one of the guides, but so terrible were the dangers, that he kept the secret, only revealing it on his death bed to his confessor; and it was by following his directions, that a party was finally enabled to reach the summit.

The honor of first scaling the summit, aside from the professional guides, belongs to Drs. De Saussure and Paccard. Their object, in making the ascent, was mainly of a scientific nature; they transported thither their barometers, thermometers and hygrometers; ascertained the latitude and longitude, and some facts in relation to the atmosphere, beside other matters interesting to philosophers and men of science. Their ascent, though attended with great danger, was accomplished in safety, and they returned prouder of their achievement, than if they had discovered a new continent. The next ascent of any importance was that of Dr. Hamel and his party, which took place in 1820; — ever memorable to the guides, and the inhabitants of the valley, from the horrid catastrophe which attended it. This, we believe, is the only occasion when lives have been lost, or indeed when any serious accident has occured in attempting the ascent. It is thought that this was the result of recklessness. The party had proceeded as far as the Grand Mulets, and halted for the night, when a violent storm came on, and loosened the avalanches, so that they were continually rushing across the path at some point or other; but in spite of these warnings, when the storm had cleared away, they set out, and attempted the last half of the ascent. As might have

Digitized by Google

been expected, an avalanche soon overtook them, and hurled a part of them into eternity. It seems a miracle that any escaped; as it was, three of the guides were lost, and some of the rest were severely injured. It is almost needless to add, that the remainder of the party then turned back and gave up the attempt.[1]

The most thrilling account we have ever read of the ascent of Mont Blanc, is that of Mr. Auldjo, who accomplished the feat on the 8th and 9th of August, 1827. Those who are desirous of learning the perils and the pleasures of the enterprize, will do well to read his book. It contains fuller details, and more elaborate descriptions, than any book we have seen on the subject. It is not calculated, however, to arouse a timid man to make the attempt. Indeed, it requires pretty strong nerves to read of the dangers of the ascent, as Mr. Auldjo has depicted them. We cannot help thinking however, that he has exaggerated them, in some instances, in order to make himself a hero. Be this as it may, it is certain that the guides, and inhabitants of the region, do not regard the ascent so perilous, as fatiguing. Mr. Talfourd assures us that there is no other danger save this; and *this* prevented him from reaching the summit. He says, "I was assured by the *chef* and by all the guides, that there was no more danger than always attends walking on the ice among crevices, and to the guides who are accustomed to such exercises, none whatever; — and I saw nothing to prove this judgement erroneous." Much undoubtedly depends upon the state of the weather, and the circumstances of the season for some months previous. These matters may be accurately determined before starting; and if one is fool-hardy enough to make the attempt when the path is blocked up by avalanches, instead of waiting till the road is clear, he betrays more his own wilfulness, than his competency to judge of the real perils of the assent. The real dangers are from the avalances, and the crevices in the ice. The former are large masses of snow detatched from the upper part of the mountain, and rushing with a force nothing human

[1] The reader will find an abridged account of the above disaster, in Christian Examiner, Vol. 1, new series, pp. 66, 67. Also a full account in New Monthly Magazine. Vol. 1, p. 156.

Digitized by Google

can withstand toward the valley. They are absolutely terrific; — the crash they make in falling is not unlike the loudest thunder; whole villages have been buried by them. It is frequently the case that they are so nicely poised, that the least concussion of the atmosphere will bring them down. Travellers in certain parts of the Alps are treated to the sight of an avalanche for the price usually paid in America for a drink;— boys are stationed in the road with a small cannon, the discharge of which brings down the avalanches, for the sight of those who have curiosity enough to pay three *sous*. Great caution is requisite in ascending Mont Blanc, at some points of the path; a shout, or even a word spoken in a common tone, might endanger the lives of the whole party; when in the vicinity of

> ——"the toppling crags of ice,
> And avalanches which a breath brings down."

The crevices in the glacier are formed by "the constant movement of the body towards the valley, which separates immense parts of it. The higher masses, meeting with some slight opposition, remain stationary; the lower, proceeding in their course, widen the breach, and thus throughout the whole glacier, in every direction, are formed tremendous cracks." It requires steady nerves to cross these crevices; a feat sometimes accomplished by a bridge of snow strong enough to support one at a time, and sometimes, the only means of crossing is, by laying down the batons, or long poles carried by the guides to asist in climbing, and cross on them. Mr. Auldjo gives the following account of one of these feats:

"Soon after we arrived at the edge of another crevice, over which we could see but one bridge, that not of ice, but of snow only, and so thin that it was deemed impossible to trust to it. A plan was resorted to which enabled us to pass over in safety. Our batons were placed on it, and in so doing, the centre gave way, and fell into the gulph; however, enough remained on each side, to form supports for the ends of these poles, and nine of them made a narrow bridge, requiring great precaution and steadiness to traverse. Other crevices were passed over, on bridges of snow, too weak to allow of walking on, or too extended to admit this application of the poles. A strong guide managed to creep over, a rope being tied round the waist of a second, who lay

Digitized by Google

on his back: he was in that position pulled across by the first. In this manner the whole party were drawn singly over the crevice."

The above is a fair specimen of the hazzards encountered by Mr. Auldjo, at every portion of his ascent. It seems to have been his good fortune to surmount more dangers than any other who has attempted the assent, all of which contribute to make his book very entertaining. We cannot resist the temptation to give the reader Mr. Talfourd's account of crossing one of these formidable crevices:

"I had scarcely entered on the glacier, when I was delighted to observe all my brisk comrades at a dead stop; they had far outstripped me and my guides in the ascent of the stony regions; I was glad of any temporary obstacle which enabled me to regain them. I found them on the brink of the first and most formidable — indeed the only really formidable — crevice of the glacier, a jagged slit of about seven or eight yards in width at the opening, narrowing as it slanted downwards, and deepening in color from the loveliest pale green into darkness; while, from a hundred fathoms below, the sound of rushing water was heard, as if a subterraneous river was forcing a way through the foundations of the glacier. Across this gulf stretched a narrow wall of ice, connecting our side with that beyond; and over this we were to pass it, unless we should make an experimental circuit, of unknown extent, to find a termination of the crevice; and when I arrived, I found everything prepared for the passage. Some of the guides already stood on the opposite brink, one of whom held a rope, while another guide held it on our side, and so formed a rail; holding by which, we one by one crossed in safety. The narrowness of this ledge may be guessed by the exploit which one young gentleman performed,—who, instead of walking, placed himself astride upon it, and directing the rope to be lowered to suit his equestrian position, drew himself along, amidst the cheers and laughter of the spectators. I was astonished then, I am puzzled now, at the real composure with which I performed my own part; for though generally affected with distressing dizziness on any height, although assured of perfect safety, I felt here no apprehension; no sinking of the heart; not a qualm. I can account for this only by the extreme beauty of the colors of the chasm itself: its purity and celestial loveliness; which absorbed the sense of danger, so that 'its beauty' did not 'make me effeminate,' but for the moment brave." (pp. 276, 277.)

We should judge from the various descriptions given of the two principal glaciers of Mont Blanc, that a great change

Digitized by Google

has taken place in their outward appearance within the last few years. A companion of Dr. Hamel in his disastrous journey, thus speaks of the Glacier des Bossons — The Mer de Glace, which has been compared to a sea suddenly congealed in the midst of a storm, cannot, our guides assured us, enter into any competition with it. The fissures were so great, so wide, and so deep — the different views varying every instant, which it presents, are so awful, so fantastic, that no idea of them can be presented to the mind by the most eloquent pen. At one time the traveller finds himself denied apparently all further progress by an immense, precipitious tower of ice; this is surmounted by a stair-case of notches, which one of the guides cuts in the ice with a hatchet which he carries for the purpose. Then he must descend into an awful chasm, from which he emerges in like manner. Again he meets with fissures, called by the guides *crevasses*, of uncertain depths, which are crossed by laying the ladder over them and passing on all fours." This account does not vary materially from those of Mr. Auldjo, and Capt. Sherwill; indeed, the description given by the latter is more terrific and fearful; but when visited by Mr. Talfourd, it presented a far different appearance: — he says, —

"Whatever it may have been, or may become hereafter, its surface presented to me nothing more formidable than a huge waste of the purest frozen snow, spread amidst enormous rocks, tending upwards at a steep but not dangerous elevation, and riven into parts by irregular crevices, which alone remained to justify the terrific descriptions of former aspirants; and even these were rarely broad enough to be terrible. Its first aspect was that of an immense white sheet, which might have been let down from heaven, puckered up and fastened at irregular heights to the rocks which bounded each side of the prospect, and floating down gracefully from its fastenings. Towards the edges, indeed, where it came in contact with the rocks in which it is thus imbedded, there appeared, on a near approach, vast walls and columns and tables of ice, which sometimes looked as if they grew out of the rock; these were pierced by caverns of the purest white, sometimes draped with icicles, and embossed with fantastic shapes; little chapels of exquisite tracery, in which altars were not wanting; recesses as beautiful in their dazzling fragility, as the Cave of Fingal at Staffa, in the sculptured beauty of its roof, and the sable

Digitized by Google

majesty of its unperishing columns. But the field of the glacier, except where split by crevices, presented no obstacle to ordinary up-hill walking, beyond the annoyance of being sometimes shoe-deep in the loosened snow, and the slipperiness betrayed by a brighter glistening, which the nailed shoes and spiked pole would have enabled me to encounter, even if the arm of the guide had not been always ready to anticipate the least assistence." (pp. 275, 276.)

The passage of the glacier usually occupies about four hours. To pass it, and gain the Grand Mulets is the end of the first day's journey. Here, on a ledge of rocks, more fit for the habitation of eagles than men, the travellers spend the night in perfect safety, being entirely sheltered from the reach of avalanches. A fire is kindled, knapsacks are opened, corks are drawn, and the feats of the day crowned by the indispensable accompaniment of dinner. Here chickens were eaten "whose bones, prematurely exalted into fossils, will supply important matter of speculation to aspiring geologists, and be produced to wandering scientific associations in future ages." We should judge from Mr. Talfourd's account, that his party at least, had a merry time of it on their rocky shelf. His description of the sunset from this place is so beautiful, that we cannot resist the temptation to give it to our readers:

"Soon after I had thus "set up my rest," the grand process of sunsetting began; and solemn as have been many sunsets to me, I never saw one — I will not say nearly equal to this — but one resembling it; for the difference was not in degree, but in kind. Above and around, there was not a cloud — not a speck to dim the deepening azure of the sky, nor a fleecy breath of mist wafted or lingering about the towers or domes of the mountain. These gloamed for a few minutes in deeper rose-color than that which appeared to clothe them at this hour from below; the summit, as usual, retained it last; and when it faded, it left them in the cold whiteness of the dawn. Thus far — with the grandeur above us — all passed in its usual procession of glory; but while I watched those receding tints, flocks of clouds arose below; and filled up the valley of Chamouni to the brim with tissues waving grayly, like floating shrouds. They were then seen creeping up within the folds of the valley beyond, till that also assumed, as far as it was revealed, the same spectral veil — while

Digitized by Google

the top of the Brèven, the Aiguille Varens, and the head of the Buet, stood out like islands in that solemn sea. But beyond — in the expanse to the right of the Brèven top, what glory was disclosed! — a heaven-tinged cloud-land, not to be gazed at from below by a subject-mortal, but to be looked down into as from a purer seat — a subjected enchantment spread beneath us — as if, from some pinnacle of heaven, the eye were permitted to gaze upon its lower glories, the habitations and the array of angels. The first appearance of this vision was that of a celestial city, all of sapphire, circling a lake of azure, while far away in measureless distance, legions of angelic hosts — shapeless as those of Rembrandt, descending on Jacob's slumber, but giving like them the sense of winged glories, were ranged; while tents and pavilions of violet and gold, behind them, seemed to bespeak a martial array. Presently these splendors became all confused,— and then a sterner grandeur reigned; a scene of huge purple caverns and golden rocks, but beside a sapphire sea studded with islands of deeper gold; and then the colors blended, and faded, and nothing but one heap of purple clouds filled the place of the gorgeous vision; and I was alone with the rock, the snow and the stars." (pp. 286, 287.)

About midnight, the party are aroused by the guides, and then commences the toil of scaling the summit. The danger of the crevices is passed, but that of the avalanches now begins. Such too, is the rarity of the atmosphere, that but few steps can be taken without stopping to rest. Sometimes a violent headache and nausea come on, together with the taste and scent of blood, as though it were about to burst from the nostrils. Few men have the requisite physical power to finish the ascent, unaided. Mr. Auldjo says, that he was dragged up the last ascent by the guides. Mr. Talfourd gave it up, at about half the distance from the Grand Mulets to the summit; although, he informs us, that the guides offered to carry him to the summit. This was the case with nearly all his party. Mr. Bosworth, and one other of the party with their guides, alone reached the summit, at seven o'clock. It seems hard to be obliged to retreat, but necessity knows no other law.

The view from the summit of Mont Blanc is the grandest and most extensive in Europe, perhaps in the world. The traveller once there, the kingdom of Sardinia, parts of France, Switzerland, and Italy, are spread out as a

Digitized by Google

mass beneath his feet. But this is not all the compensation the traveller receives. Setting aside the extreme beauty and grandeur of the various parts of the mountain itself, it is only in the ascent that one is able to grasp in his imagination the massiveness, and height of Mont Blanc. Diagrams and figures are inadequate to this; the line of cypher that tells of the distance of a star, never presents to the imagination the faintest type of the trackless distance which its light has journeyed; and the same holds true in regard to Mont Blanc; viewed from the valley of Chamouni, it is hard to persuade one's self that it is the Saul among the army of giants that cluster around; its slippery path must be trod, its wide waste of snow be crossed, before the mind can comprehend its huge and massive proportions. Such an idea of greatness, it seems to me, would richly repay the fatigue of the ascent. Cold-blooded men, who can see nothing in mountains but so much good land wasted, and to whom Niagara suggests the idea of a good water privilege, may look upon the ascent of Mont Blanc as sheer folly and needless exposure of life; — but we believe otherwise; all things worth seeing or enjoying cost an effort, and involve some risk. There is less danger in ascending Mont Blanc than in crossing the ocean, and if the gathering of wealth will justify the latter, surely the gathering of knowledge, and the communion with "nature in her loftier modes," afforded by the former, will justify all the risk, aye make it a virtue. Others may think as they will, but for our part, we would give the three best years of our life, to stand for one hour, with a clear sky above and around us, on the summit of Mont Blanc.

The descent of the mountain, though attended with as great risk, is accomplished much more rapidly than the ascent. In many places, the travellers slide swiftly down a long plane, guided by their poles. The time occupied in the descent is about one-third that of the ascent; the whole time occupied from the departure to the return being two days and one night.

We are satisfied that we have given but an imperfect and meagre sketch of the nature of this undertaking. It requires more space than the limits of this article will allow; all, therefore, who would know more, must consult

Digitized by Google

the various works extant on the subject. We have already devoted more space to it, than we intended.

We cannot close without referring to the water-falls which are so numerous, and beautiful among the Alps. The most beautiful of these are, the Staubbach, which rushes down the Wengern Alp into the valley of Lauterbrunnen, the Nant d' Arpenaz, in the pass of the Cluses, and the Giesbach near the Lake of Brienz. The former of these three is the most celebrated. Its height is about nine hundred feet, — a distance so great that the water becomes mere mist, long before it reaches the bottom. Nearly every traveller that visits it has described it as most grand and picturesque. Byron in his Manfred thus speaks of it:

> "It is not noon, — the sun-bow's rays still arch
> The torrent with the many hues of heaven,
> And roll the sheeted silver's waving column
> O'er the crag's headlong perpendicular,
> And fling its lines of foaming light along,
> And to and fro, like the pale courser's tail,
> The giant steed to be bestrode by Death,
> As told in the Apocalypse."

The figure here used is striking, original, and unsurpassed. All others we have seen are tame and insipid compared to this. Mr. Talfourd says: "It presents one effect entirely its own; and which the bright morning sun rendered complete for our enjoyment — of a small-arched rainbow which seems actually painted on the dingy rock level with the eye — and which, as you descend the drizzling hollow into which the stream drips, descends with you — as hope lowers itself to the gradations of misfortune, and mocks the sufferer still in its lowest depths." What could be more exquisite and beautiful than this? We give one more description from Mr. Talfourd, of one of the falls of the Arve, a stream fed by the glaciers of Mont Blanc: "Down a channel in the rock a stunt rivulet rushes, then throws itself across a short perpendicular ledge, and meeting a hollow rock, inclined upwards, leaps high in air, and after forming a wide arch, falls into a chasm — its proper bed — a hundred feet below; a most brilliant *jet d' eau*, of Nature's own invention. The effect is as beautiful as it is startling. The pure water, which

Digitized by Google

thus spurns the earth, illumines the air with a million of drops, which take varying colors in the sunlight, and perpetually form, and break, and renew small rainbows on the pinnacles of stone that spring about its basin, while the water, when it reaches in its descent the shade of the chasm, falls in a close column of crystal."

In closing our extracts from Mr. Talfourd's book, we must heartily thank him for the instruction and amusement he has afforded us. We hope to see his work re-printed in this country, for it is worth a thousand such books as Mr. Headly's and Dr. Cheever's. A. H.

Art. XV.

Literary Notices.

1. General History of the Christian Religion and Church: from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated from the First, Revised and Altered throughout according to the Second Edition. By Joseph Torrey, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Vermont, &c., &c. Volume Second: comprising the Second Great Division of the History. Boston: Published by Crocker & Brewster. London: Wiley & Putnam. 1848. 8vo. pp. xl. 768.

We do not adopt all the conclusions of Neander; but there is little danger of extravagance in extolling the unequalled learning, systematic thought, and wide reach of view, exhibited in his history. Prof. Torrey has now carried down the translation of the work to the close of the first two, and most important, grand divisions, ending A. D. 590, when most of the church doctrines had been formed. We thank him for the service he has rendered to the theologians of this country and of great Britain; and earnestly hope that he will receive such patronage as shall induce him to proceed with the subsequent volumes of the original. Should opportunity be found, we shall, before the close of the year, enter into a more particular consideration of the two volumes already presented to the American and English public.

2. Duties of Young Women. By E. H. Chapin. Boston: George W. Briggs, 403 Washington St., 1848.

This is a fresh, hearty, earnest book. Although such commendation seems natural from the known characteristics of Mr.

Digitized by Google

Chapin's mind, we feel that it is the highest praise for a work bearing a title like that before us. Such books are generally repulsive, because they are cold, formal and mechanical. They are preceptive and technical, and weary the mind and chill the heart by enforcing the dry details of morality, without imparting any charm to virtue, animating the affections, or encouraging the will. The Author tells us in the Preface, that he does not "offer it as a *manual* for young women, but as a discussion of certain great principles of life and conduct." For this very reason, the topics, treated as they are with a healthy, vigorous eloquence, and adorned with natural but winning illustration, will have far greater influence with the class to which they are addressed, while the book is made a most profitable and pleasant one for the general reader.

The work comprises six lectures upon the following themes—"The Position of Woman;" "Culture;" "Accomplishments;" "Duty;" "Female Influence," and "The Maternal Relation." We take the following passage from the first Discourse, as a fair sample of the strength and fervor of the composition, and as an exhibition of the soundness of Mr. Chapin's views. After dwelling upon the point that the destiny of woman is to rule in the sphere of the affections, and the great and essential department of Home, he adds—"Or if the restrictions of poverty, or the calls of domestic affliction forbid any wider ministrations, then will it be hers still more to illustrate the true dignity and power of woman, in watching and waiting, in patient endurance and unwearied effort, in filling that narrower orbit with the fulness of love, and illuminating that dark fortune with the steady radiance of constancy and faith. And whenever she thus acts, at home or abroad, let her feel assured that man does no work which excels the grandeur of hers. The warrior watching on the tented field with the destinies of a nation committed to his trust, or striking in the conflict for liberty and right, may act in a wider sphere; but his work is not greater than hers as she keeps her vigil by the bedside of suffering, or toils in the rigorous and uncheered routine of domestic duty. The poet may make music that shall charm the ages, and elevate the race, and from the height of his lofty inspiration win immortal renown; but his melody is not equal to that which a Dix, or a Fry, or a Sarah Martin, wakes in the guilty heart when she has "touched it to finer issues" and taught the alienated spirit the worth of human sympathy, and subdued the stern nature to Christian meekness, until the prisoner's hymns of penitence and praise go up at midnight, and the rugged walls of his dungeon are tapestried with dreams of heaven. The statesman may regenerate nations by his polity, the orator may shake

Digitized by Google

senates with his eloquence, the philosopher win new worlds by discovery; but greater is she who stands by the earliest springs of thought and shapes their tendency, and drops into them the balm of her affection, the purity of her virtue; greater she to whom is committed the plastic mind that shall control nations, and sway hearts, and course the stars. The deepest life of nature is silent and obscure; so, often, the elements that move and mould society are the results of the sister's counsel and the mother's prayer."

The author tells us that these discourses "passed almost immediately from the pulpit to the press, and therefore were but slightly revised." The style, then, speaks well for his ability and taste. Every page bears testimony that it was written by a free and ready, but not a careless pen, while many passages are unusually elegant and musical. But the slightest merits of the book, after all, are its literary merits. It is an earnest, noble Christian volume, and we trust that our denomination may add many more such to the religious literature of the country. T.

3. Poems by James Russel Lowell. Second Series. Cambridge: Published by George Nichols. Boston: B. B. Muzzy and Company. 1848. 12mo. pp. 184.

The general fault of this poetry (for there is poetry here, or at least snatches of it,) may be expressed, we think, in two words: it is fragmentary in its composition, and feverish in spirit. Seldom are its images complete: they are fragments of images, vivid it may be, but in pieces, neither presenting nor suggesting a whole. There is also a perpetual effort to "o'erstep the modesty of nature," and a straining after absurd combinations such as we form in distempered dreams, when all shapes are passing, with us, into ever new metamorphoses. The Pythoness inflates herself with vapors, and deems it inspiration. We find too a tendency, which we have observed in some of the German poets, to confound the respective offices of the several senses,— the ear seeing, and the touch hearing. This is a characteristic of the Orientals, and belongs to that species of taste which, from time immemorial, has led them to delight in the incongruous and monstrous. We mention these faults the more freely, and perhaps with some exaggeration, because our author is evidently capable of better things, were he but content to be what God made him, a western man instead of a Brahmin, and would he then patiently work out his ideas into consistency.

Digitized by Google

Art. XVI.

Memory and Conscience, in the Future State.

If this life be indeed the shadow, and the next the reality; if the reserved inheritance of the future be all that sanctifies the gift of the present, and if the assurance of that be all that saves this from being the mocking pageant of a motley show, a glittering, tinselled cheat, where we play at being, but are not; no loftier labor may occupy our maturest speculative and reasoning powers, than the consideration of that state, its materials, its modes, its promises.

Vain is the attempt to repress this earnest zeal of the soul by insisting that duty, and not destiny, should be the object of its solicitude. Destiny colors duty. Duty never lingered for a moment where hope no longer remained; and hope is but the blossom of destiny. Duty stretches out her commanding rod, not over cold ashes, but over heaven-aspiring flames. Around the solid earth of duty, stretch the ethereal heavens of hope; the eye that cannot see the one, is blind to the other also. The whole Christian world cries out, as with a sensation of pain, against any argument which seeks to destroy, or weaken, the belief in an immortal existence. It stops its ears against the voice, however seductive its accents may be, which would wile from it this unseen inheritance, and shut its hope within the gray horizon-walls of this world.

Behind this question of mere existence there rises, however, another question more intense in interest, more urgent in importance, as to the nature of that existence. Is it pleasure? or, is it pain? Men have held the belief in this existence beyond question, have clung to it as more precious than silver, have clamored when one has so much as winked his eye at it; and yet have patiently endured, and even smiled upon, a philosophy, which transmutes this glittering ore into consuming caustic, and turns this diamond, fresh with day, into carbon black as midnight.

Digitized by Google

Nevertheless, can we suppose that the soul of man has clung to, and contended for, an inheritance of pain and shame? or has it not rather said to itself, "At the hand of the God who has given me this boon of immortal life, I will fearlessly take it as he bestows it"? Nothing but a sevenfold mail of hope, which no lance of logic can pierce through, no theological hammer break in pieces, wrapped around each personal immortal interest, can account for the serene indifference with which men have listened to, and lived under, these terrors of endless perdition, and scarcely winced at them; while, if the hope of immortality were but touched, an instant outcry has been raised.

With scarce an exception, if there be one, every argument for immortality which Natural Theology presents, is of necessity an argument for a happy immortality. There is, indeed, an argument which is sometimes used, inferring the necessity of another life from the imperfect distribution of rewards and punishments in this, which, to some minds, may furnish an exception, of a glaring nature, to the remark just made. It seems difficult, however, to imagine by what means such an argument has ever gained so extensive credence as it has. Take, for example, the great sin of slavery; how can the rule of this argument be applied satisfactorily to it? Will the poor slave find in the sight of his master's sufferings, in another world, any compensation for his own pangs in this? Can a wise law decree that he shall be happy there, simply because he suffered here? The great wrong was committed upon him here; what will justice, there, do to heal his wounds? Nothing, in the way of rewards and punishments; the argument, therefore, is nothing worth.

Concerning this future existence it is our intention to offer some thoughts and reasonings. They are not reduced to a system, but if, in this vast field, we can contribute to fix one point that heretofore has been uncertain, or root up one false landmark, our labor will not have been in vain.

The idea of mere existence is complex, if the existence be a sentient one. Several things are involved in it, as inseparable concomitants. More complex is the idea of a continued or prolonged existence; while the notion of an existence, of the length of whose past duration the pos-

Digitized by Google

sessor is conscious, with a hope for its perpetuity, is an idea of still greater complexity. This last, is the idea which answers to our anticipations of an immortal existence; as the second might answer to the existence which we had in our earliest infancy. To this self-conscious existence, memory seems indispensable; nor do we see how there can be really any immortality such as the soul desires without it. No being, not consciously connected with what I am now, can represent my proper immortality a thousand years hence. He may wear my name, and keep my treasures, and fill my place, and shout my hosanna; but I cannot say to myself: "It is I, these thousand years a living soul." God and angels may have watched the evolving links of a something which, to them, may identify that being with me; but I, alas! I stand here, he there; betwixt us is a gulf, that nothing but a miracle may bridge over; and that miracle must make me feel every link in the chain that binds us in one; if there be one link lost, or one a non-conductor, the electric spark of identity will not pass through.

That I existed in childhood, I am bound to believe; and this is equivalent to saying, that my present existence is a continuation of that early life. I am bound to believe this, because others tell me so; informing me that I was born in a certain year, and have lived since then; but some four or five of those earliest years, I expressly disclaim out of my immortality at present; for, in my own consciousness, I find nothing of that existence. I believe that I had an existence then, because of my trust in the word of others, and because it accords with constantly recurring observation; as I see all others commencing their lives in the same way. It stands as a part of my life, but not of my self-conscious, immortal life. So if one fell asleep to-night, and, when the bands of sleep were dissolved, could not remember that he had ever been awake before; that would not be an awaking, but the beginning of a new life to him. If the memory of what lay beyond that sleep never came to him, his immortality could, in his own consciousness, go no farther back.

If this be not a true view, we may have existed in a score of worlds prior to this, and may be some millions of years advanced in our immortality. Nay, the system of

Digitized by Google

the "Vestiges" may be correct, and we be the representatives of the immortality of certain muscles and clams of some former period; having, by the loving-kindness and tender mercies of certain glorious laws, come thus far in our eternal metamorphoses. This view makes immortality to be simply the sense of present existence, as a result of something before; and might be very appropriate to a soul that was intended to live forever in a nut-shell, "to be, contenting its natural desire." The true immortality has a grander outlook. There are depths of life still deepening behind it; and lofty providences still loftier growing before. An anchor is cast far in the life behind — the cable runs out to it — the ship's head swings to the eternity before; she is not whirled in a perpetual eddy, but goes ever onward. If man is not, here, in the first stage only of his existence, all things conspire to blind him; he is the victim of a cruel delusion.

All our consciousness of progress would seem to depend, also, upon memory. From those serene heights, flooded with light and glory, and holy with eternal repose, the soul shall look down to the lowly vale, where she took her first upward steps; she beholds them watered with sweat and tears, sanctified by effort, consecrated by God's blessing. As she looks back, she sees the long line of footsteps that have brought her up to that mid-heaven where she stands; upon either side, through all the way, are the marks where have been the feet of God's ministering, guiding, or chastening angels. Not heaven's highest glories must hide those precious memorials from her sight. Their undying remembrances thrill like electric fire through the songs of "Worthy the Lamb;" and the ascription "Glory to God in the highest," crowns each swelling Alleluia, and seals each closing Amen.

These arguments are no reasonings by *analogy.* They are, in their main features, arguments from necessity. We are not saying, what the soul shall be if it continue to be such as it has been, but what it must be, if it fulfil the idea of an immortal soul. We speak of that which is woven into the very texture of man's being; so, that if it be cut out, the whole web ravels. We thus conclude, that the power and the use of memory must go with the soul as a part of its immortality; as one of the conditions of a consciousness of immortality.

Digitized by Google

Having stated, thus definitely, what seems to be the fact upon this point, we, of course, bind ourselves to accept every legitimate consequence of that fact, and every necessary deduction from it; while we equally reject those which are illegitimate.

We now turn to the consideration of one of those deductions. It is matter of universal belief, that, in the future state, we shall have vast accessions of knowledge, and an immense increase of spiritual and moral insight. The spirit, in that pure, clear atmosphere, sees the true color of all acts and thoughts. Entering there, the soul, it is said, is ushered into a solemn concourse of higher forms — Truth, Purity, Justice, Love, Patience, gathered around a throne, which blends all their rays into a pure and dazzling light. Here memory brings all the foul misdeeds of the earthly life — Untruth, Impurity, Injustice, Hatred, Impatience — and flings them down at the feet of the self-accusing spirit; it lifts them, one by one, and lays each on its own downcast brow; while the undying memory binds it there, a shame and a torture forever. A brow of midnight and a soul of shame, amid Heaven's glory and praise! This is Hell; — the Hell of conscience; interminable, ever deepening, like a volcano, sinking deeper the more it burns — forever. The soul, like an inflamed eye, throbs with pain, under heaven's clear light. This is the worm that never dies; the fire that is never quenched. God does not punish the sinner; he leaves him to himself.

This, if we have not mistaken, is now the philosophy of many, who uphold the doctrine of endless torment; the modern fig-leaf, which those, who are ashamed to look at their doctrine naked, have wrapped about it. It might seem that our statement with respect to memory, as a necessary concomitant of immortality, pledged us to all this. We think we can clear ourselves; but would first say, that it behoves the advocates of this system to bear in mind, that in adopting it, they are treading on new and, it may be, on perilous ground. So far as endless punishment is concerned, they have abandoned entirely the letter of many of the passages of Scripture, of which they have made, and do still make, a great use. They have turned all the fire into smoke, gaining thereby some obscurity,

Digitized by Google

but no real solidity of defence. We warn them that their system is in deadly peril if hell becomes moral. This system of retribution is the new cloth sewn into an old garment; it will make the rent worse. We warn them that there is no reason to expect any proper discrimination in the action of this memory. It can neither forget a saint's transgressions, nor a sinner's obedience. It will be exceedingly difficult to indoctrinate it with the system of a vicarious atonement. We may remember that another died for us; but it is more difficult to remember that another performed our acts for us. If such a hell as this exists, it is to be feared that it will prove exceedingly embarrassing to maintain that considerate and tender discrimination between saints and sinners, which the present exigencies of the church demand, and which the doctrine of vicarious atonement so pleasingly supplies.

But let us look a little more narrowly at this theory of a hell of memory and conscience. We cannot imagine any one as suffering from conscience, in this way, unless he feels that good is better than evil. He must feel that he has chosen the worse instead of the better part. When he feels this, what shall prevent him from forever renouncing the worse, and choosing the better part? This theory necessarily implies that God does not punish the sinner; his conscience, and his own disharmony with the light around him, punish him. He feels, then, the blessing of this light, the wo of his own darkness. He wishes for the light, as he hates his darkness. Who shall hinder him from the full fruition of his wish? If any being shall do so, that being, were it God himself, is the hinderer of good, the conservator of evil. No being but God has the power to do so; and it is easier — it is less shocking to believe in a God who will cast his creatures into a lake of fire and brimstone at once, than in such a God as this. For, as we have shown, such a torment can be sustained only where there is knowledge of the good, and a desire for it. It cannot apply to the soul wholly wedded to evil. The soul which has, of its free choice, in the full light of eternity, said, "Evil, be thou my good," cannot be supposed to feel any noticeable pangs of conscience; so that it is only to the sinner, who is convinced of the "exceeding sinfulness of sin," that the theory of punishment, under examination, would apply. This theory, then, if

Digitized by Google

sincerely carried out, implies necessarily the upward progress of all the subjects of its discipline.

A theory has been sometimes broached, in connection with this, which we may consider for a moment. An objection has been raised, that it would be cruel and unjust in God to punish men without end, for the sins of this short life. To meet this it has been assumed, that men would sin without end, and that this endless sin would properly merit endless punishment. We look on this also, as an apologetic statement of the doctrine of endless wo. Far from being serviceable, it is really destructive to the doctrine, as the following considerations will show. It is one of the dogmas of those who advance this notion, that after death all men will be tried at the judgment-bar of God; and that, according to the state in which they are then found, an endless and irrevocable doom shall then be passed upon each soul present, — some to endless joy, some to unceasing wo. But if the theory of endless sinning be correct, those who, in that judgment, are sentenced to wo without end, incur that sentence not so much for what they have done as for what they are about to do — not for the past works of time, but for the prospective works of eternity. Moreover, as their eternal state is unchangeably fixed by the irreversible awards of this judgement, they are of course bound to sin without end, willing or not, and then because of that endless sin they are justly condemned to endless pain. A justice such as this, which decrees the sin, that it may be justified in punishing it, cannot safely be called in question by any who live under its shadow! Still, if we might be allowed to go a step further, it is matter for solicitous inquiry by what means these souls, condemned beyond hope to endless sin, can possess that free agency which seems so indispensable a condition of the ability to do evil or good — to gain merit or demerit. We are determined to speak out our thought; it is this: whoever plays this great game against them, uses *loaded dice.* Theologians may phrase it as they severally please.

We look on these theories as stratagems devised to accomplish that covertly, which cannot be so well done openly, or to state that circuitously, which will not bear telling directly. If this doctrine of endless wo is to be

Digitized by Google

taught, or defended, the shortest theorem is the best and easiest: "God, of his own choice, ordains some to endless misery, some to everlasting life. Shall he not do what he will with his own?" Here, or nowhere, must this doctrine stand. If once it begins to apologize, explain, or justify, its days are numbered. The old system stood on the only safe ground. It had a sovereign God, and no excuses; sovereign over justice and mercy as well as over man.

Flimsy as these theories are, they furnish in one respect a cheering indication. They show that the repulsiveness of the doctrines which they are used to veil, is felt.

But admit that these theories are inconsistent, do not our first views of memory and conscience carry with them, as a necessary inference, the idea of sharp and protracted, if not endless suffering? Can this pure light of heaven shine upon the soul, revealing its deformities as they are daguereotyped by memory, without causing the mostr piercing shame? Must not each angry word, each hateful thought, each insidious intent, each prurient imagining, nauseate the taste of the instructed conscience? If so, with memory's increasing light, must come increasing pain, and the enwrapping shadow of the sin grow denser as the splendor amid which we live grows clearer. This is the view taken by some, and this is a hell of the most remorseless kind. Our facts concerning memory we professed to deduce from the human soul in its essential nature, and to that source we must now return for the weights and measures to test this philosophy.

We can all recall that, in our youth, we did actions which would fill us with unutterable shame were we now to do them. Many of them, under some great temptation, were done in despite of the promptings of the better nature and the warnings of conscience, and were then occasions of mental pain and shame to us. Memory clearly depicts them now to the mind. We clearly perceive how much they are at variance with glorious and sacred laws. But does our remembrance of them destroy the happiness of our lives? Does it grow more and more painful, as we advance in understanding and purity of soul? To both of these questions we must give a negative answer, and especially to the last. A little additional

Digitized by Google

light enabled us to see that we were wrong, and caused us pain, but a vast accession of light shows us, not only that we were wrong, but why we were wrong. It is purely impossible, in any healthy mind, that this great accession of light should bring a corresponding addition of remorse. For when the reasons which condemn, and dissuade from, our past conduct, become overwhelming, and the whole thing is set in an unmistakeable point of view, we feel that had we then been in possession of our present insight we could not have done as we did. These sins were the nightmare of the darkness, or the inertness of slumber; they cannot come to us, now we are awake and in the light. They were the demons that bore rule in the valley below, but cannot come up to this clearer and loftier height; they conquered us because we were there; but had the light which shows us now their exceeding hatefulness shined then, we had then, as now, abhorred and abstained. Let any person who reads these lines pause now and recall from the past several of those acts which has caused him the greatest regret and remorse. Let him consider if, out of this number, the act which he has the clearest and most abundant reasons to condemn, gives him the most pain; also, whether that pain increases with every new view which demonstrates to him the indefensibility of the act. On the contrary, is not every new view, every new principle which goes to show the criminality of the act, a new reason for saying that it was done under insufficient knowledge? Were the option allowed again, with the present light, the act would not be done.

There are occasions where a wrong act has drawn after it sorrowful and irretrievable consequences of an unforeseen nature, and the moral turpitude of the act may, in the estimate of the one who performed it, be much increased thereby. Such a case as this may be found where the great or lasting nature of the evil result makes every reason against the act a new occasion of self-accusation. This sorrow, though natural and perhaps unavoidable, is still of the same nature, in point of justice, with the decisions of those parents who estimate the punishment due their children by the magnitude of the mischief rather than the malignity of the intention. Such regrets a higher light must abate; they are human, not heavenly.

Digitized by Google

But another class of cases claims our attention; those who through wilfulness, or some other similar cause, resist the light, and sin in the face of the remonstrances of their consciences. In the first place, let us say, that every man seeks always what he supposes at the time to be his interest — or gratification, which is, for our present purpose, the same thing. But the disposition to gratify his *will*, gains an undue, an almost exclusive, ascendancy over him. This may be properly considered as an hallucination — a masquerade of the mind, where nothing appears under its true color, shape, or relation. It is a state of mind which an increase of light, if it be carried far enough, must cure; and the instant the magic circle breaks, and the man stands outside of it, he wonders at himself as the victim of such a delusion. We are bound to consider that such wilfulness on earth is never an unmitigated nor a self-conscious contest against pure light. Of such a contest, then, we have no example from the human soul. It would be an assumption then to say that the soul is inclined to such a resistance, or even capable of it. Even those who resisted the divinest manifestation of light ever given on earth, and crucified the Son of God, "knew not what they did." Will any man dare to say that, could those who stood around Jesus in Pilate's judgment-hall have seen his mission, and his character, as he himself saw and felt it, or even as a good Christian now sees it, they would have crucified him? Remember Saul of Tarsus on his way to Damascus. Who so presumptuous as to say that there is one soul among all the millions of our race, that, provided it had received the same heavenly vision, would have been disobedient to it? We must presume that nothing was done in that instance contrary to Saul's free agency. We might properly think that no more was revealed to him then, than every human soul must see when the great truths of the eternal world are unveiled before it.

We have in the apostle an illustrious instance of the effect of memory and moral light. Paul the apostle remembered Saul of Tarsus, but it was as a shadow behind, not as a spectre before. The things which are behind he forgets, and presses on towards the things before. They are not so forgotten as to be lost out of his mind, but they

Digitized by Google

do not sully his ever-increasing joy. As he turns from the gloom behind to the glory before, his thanksgiving is all the loftier. But we shall be sharply reminded here that Paul had repented, and is not to be classed with contumacious sinners. True, he repented, but he did not thereby lose his memory of the past. We are discussing the effect of a great moral light in connection with a memory of past sin. Our argument applies only to those minds where light is *felt*, and where conscience and memory abide; no others can be called in question under this theory; no others can be subjects of the rewards or punishments it contemplates. Paul had all these, and is therefore an instance precisely in point. — But we must pursue this question of repentance a little farther. Repentance is sincere sorrow for sin, and implies the forsaking of sin. But has it not been made abundantly apparent that the theory we are discussing assumes sorrow for sin as its vital point? We think beyond all dispute that it has, — that sorrow, produced by the pure light that convicts the soul, is a guarantee that sin will be forsaken. What more will its advocates have? But perhaps it is thought we, in our turn, by speaking of the sorrow of repentance, have yielded the great point in debate. We have not. We questioned the idea of a long-enduring struggle in the soul produced by the light of truth and the shadow of memory. We would embody our creed upon this point in the words of the apostle John, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; *for we shall see him as he is.*" God, when he arrayed the flower in beauty, the earth in gladness, the seas in glory, and the heavens in solemn grandeur, formed the eye to perceive them all properly, and according to their nature perfectly. But on the lofty magnificence of the eternal truth, we have as yet gazed only through a glass darkly. On that sublime impersonation of truth, the Lord Jesus Christ, we look only through the medium of a lettered page, in which truly the soul, quick with faith, finds much. But who that has heard a discourse rush flaming and thundering from the lips of an eloquent orator, or flowing serene as a majestic river from his living soul, and afterwards read the same from a printed page, knows not the difference? What

Digitized by Google

words will convey the majestic mein of a Washington, or the soul-quailing glance of a Napoleon?

With respect to this higher truth this is not all; the atmosphere around our souls is not clear; all the mists and magical enchantments of earth envelope us. Let these break away, let Christ appear, let the light of God's ineffable glory stream like sunlight through the soul; and as the captive child who has heard of a father amid the wild faces that surround him in a barbarous land, thrills at home with the first vision of a father's face, so let the soul released behold with enraptured eye the beatific vision of the Eternal Truth, and "believe, and live." E. F.

Art. XVII.

Our Duties in respect to the Skepticism of the Age.

Skepticism commenced its attack upon Christianity in the morning of its introduction, and from that time to the present its warfare has been unremitting. It has not always pursued the same system of tactics — employed the same weapons, or fought from the same position. Nor has it always directed its attack against the same point. Its system of warfare — its weapons — its position, and its point of attack, it has artfully chosen to suit the exigencies of different ages. Now, standing under its own colors, and from its own barren waste, it has boldly charged upon the religion of Jesus. From this position it has suddenly shifted and stealthily taken its stand under the banner of the Cross and within the intrenchments of the Church itself. For a time it has wielded the weapons of philosophy. These it has suddenly laid aside to seize upon the sword of criticism; and, when disarmed in the conflict, it has shot the poisoned arrows of sarcasm and ridicule. In one age it has aimed at this point in Chris-

Digitized by Google

tianity — in the next it has turned its batteries upon that point.

We are obliged to admit that, in the course of this protracted warfare it has, at times, met with apparent success. It has dislodged theologians from some positions which they had fortified, and swept from the field certain troops of argument which they had marshalled. But let not this fact weaken our confidence in Christianity. Not one of its truths has fallen in the conflict. It is only over erroneous opinions and statements of Christianity, that skepticism has, in any instance, gained an advantage. Back of these errors, the great fundamental doctrines of the gospel remain as impregnable as when first planted by the Son of God.

If Christians had correctly stated the doctrines of their religion — if they had lived in perfect accordance with its precepts, and thus, in their lives, exhibited its legitimate fruits, skepticism would long ago have retired from the contest and "laid its martial armor by." Such an illustration would have furnished its best argument and its most powerful defence. But this they have failed to do. They have misapprehended its doctrines, and varied essentially from its rules of life. And these errors, both of faith and practice, have been put forth under the name of Christianity; and thus vulnerable points have been presented to the searching eye of skepticism.

I here venture the opinion that much of the skepticism of the present day owes its existence to erroneous statements of Christian doctrine, and to the inconsistent practice of the professed followers of Christ, rather than to any natural antipathy on the part of men towards either the doctrines, precepts, or spirit of Christianity as set forth and illustrated by its divine founder. Be this as it may, one thing is certain, that skepticism, in the stolen livery of Christianity, is busily at work undermining the columns of that faith which is based upon Jesus Christ. I, therefore, believe it to be incumbent upon us, as a denomination, to array our strength against this enemy of our common faith and to aim at its subversion.

As a sect we have bestowed but little attention, comparatively, upon skepticism in its latest form. A few years ago champions from our fraternity stood foremost in

Digitized by Google

the ranks of those who charged upon the position which it then occupied. Perhaps one reason for our inactivity is to be found in the fact that, until quite recently, we have been exempt from its disturbing influence. But such is our condition no longer. We have been slightly disturbed by its force and have not yet recovered from the derangement which it produced. One circumstance, however, is worthy of consideration, and should inspire us with hope. It is this; that none of the best educated and strongest minds of our denomination have been swayed from their wonted orbits. It is only the more volatile comets of our theologic heavens that have yielded to its sway. The effect produced upon them, however, was sudden if not unexpected. They paused on their course the moment it crossed their track — bounded at random for a time — then, threateningly, brandishing their train of fire-mist, they shot out into the trackless infinite! Whether they will ever, at any remote period, return to our system, is a question beyond our mathematics. But the part which we have to perform is not to watch their erratic course or to calculate its eccentricity. It is our duty rather to remove the cause which has thus disturbed them, that similar effects may not be repeated.

I am aware that there are many conscientious minds who deem it better to let this skepticism take its own course. In their opinion any notice bestowed upon it will only serve to give notoriety to, and to invest with greater influence, those who have enlisted in its defence. Besides, it is said, that often, during the existence of the Church, it would have been better for its interests if its chivalrous champions had wielded their lances of logic less. All this may be true. But the ill success referred to is attributable wholly to the indiscreet mode of warfare pursued, and to the unchristian spirit in which it was prosecuted. I would be the last to desire that such a spirit might enter the list against the skepticism of the times. I am certain that the result of the contest would be prejudicial to the cause of gospel truth and love. But can we not meet this skepticism in a better spirit? May we not be governed in our warfare against it by our religion of charity and peace? So thinks the writer: and firmly believing this, he would see the denomination to

Digitized by Google

which he belongs performing its part in the great battle against infidelity. To engage in that contest is especially our duty. We have received Christianity in its broadest and most liberal form. For this reason we are the best prepared to answer the cavils of skepticism, and to set forth in unobjectionable distinctness the great principles of our religion. Partialism has never been able to answer all the objections with which infidelity has armed itself. It never can answer them while it occupies its present narrow and false position. Whenever skepticism surrenders its sword it will be into the hands of a liberal Christianity. I, therefore, believe that if we will enter the field and acquit ourselves in a manner accordant with the genius of our religion, we can do more than any other sect to stay the course of the skepticism of the age. While, then, we are endowed with this ability, is it not our duty to exert it? My doctrine with regard to such matters is this: If an enemy sow tares in my wheat-field by night, I will make a virtue of expediency, and let both grow together until harvest-time. But if I see him scattering his tare-seed by the broad light of day, it is as much my duty to stay his hand as it is to cultivate the wheat which I have sown.

Assuming it to be our duty to contend against the skepticism of our day, I shall proceed to consider the course most proper to be pursued. A wise general, before he lays his plan of battle and disposes of his own forces, acquaints himself with the resources as well as with the position of his enemy. We will be instructed by his example, and proceed, first, to enquire for the causes which have produced the prevalent form of skepticism, and from which it derives its supplies.

1. The opinion has already been intimated that erroneous statements of Christian doctrine were one cause of the skepticism of our day. Some minds are so constituted that when once ardently enlisted in the endeavor to bring community up to the perception and acknowledgement of a previously hidden truth, they receive an impetus which carries them far beyond the same into an opposite extreme. There are always certain outside characters engaged in every revolution in whom the cen-

Digitized by Google

trifugal overcomes the centripetal force, and throws them off in a tangent to their original direction. Their

> "Vaulting ambition o'erleaps itself,
> And falls on t' other side."

Many of the doubting ones of our day, who claim the Christian name, were thrown into the extreme position which they occupy in the manner above explained. They cried out for reform — lifted stoutly at the heavy wheel of progress, and, when it was fairly under way, they were born up by it; but, ere they had described a cycloid, they were projected by its velocity in a direction at right angles with that in which they first began to move.

Christians assumed more for the Bible than it ever claimed. Their unfounded assumptions arrested attention. Thoughtful minds solemnly protested against the claims which had been assumed. A revolution was projected; and one of the results has been, that certain minds, more ardent or less perfectly poised than others, have been hurled into an opposite extreme, and now deny all the claims to authority on the part of that venerable book. Certain theologians seemed to take the position that the miracles of Christ were the only seals of his authority. Against this, others protested. The argument commenced, and while the public mind, as a whole, has been brought nearer to the truth of the matter, a few have been thrown, by the momentum of the revolution, upon the ultra ground that miracles are but myths. A reaction against the false *doctrines* which theologians have asserted were taught in the Bible, has produced kindred results in favor of skepticism. Upon every error in the faith of Christians has ripened fruit, which, in the shock of battle, has fallen into the hands of infidelity; and had it not been for this its energies would long since have been wasted, and it would have retired exhausted from the field of conflict.

2. But there is another cause more prolific than the one just recited. I allude to the inconsistent conduct of Christian professors. As much as the disciples of Christ have failed in matters of faith, they have failed still more in matters of practice. I confess that when I reflect upon the immoralities which have been perpetrated in the name

Digitized by Google

of Christianity, it is no marvel to me that skepticism stalks in our midst by noon-day light. When it is remembered that the giant evils of the age have apologists in the Christian church, and that there are those who break the "bread of the sacrament," that attempt to justify such evils by an appeal to the authority of the Bible, can it be a matter of surprise to any that infidelity grows bold and mocks at our shrines and altars? Now, that such inconsistent practice is the cause of much of the prevailing skepticism, is evidenced by facts which are presented us in the history of many of our most radical reformers. Some of these men, who now lift their heel against all which we have been wont to venerate, were once members of churches — ardent defenders of the religious institutions and doctrines which they now so violently oppose. And what has so materially changed their position and views? No other cause so much as moral obliquity on the part of Christian professors. It is very true that good logic has had nothing to do with their extreme transition. Their hasty leap was taken in the heat of an indignation excited by the abuse of things sacred and holy. They were rendered so madly impetuous by the violations of principles which they so often beheld, that, in showing their contempt for such hypocrisy, they strode recklessly over principle itself. Besides these few erratic spirits, there are numerous others who — owing to their connection with the reform movements of the day — have been forced to contemplate often the indifference of Christians, that indulge in a looseness of expression in relation to Christianity and its ordinances which betrays a tendency in their minds towards downright skepticism. The abuse of the Christian profession which they have so often witnessed, has served to lower their estimate of that profession's importance. It will do no good to say that such effects betray little reflection and an unsound judgement. He that is acquainted with human nature will acknowledge their naturalness; and the truth will remain that much of the skepticism which now prevails is the legitimate offspring of this prolific parent.

3. Besides the causes of skepticism enumerated above, there are other minor causes which neither time nor space will allow us to particularize. Prominent among these is

Digitized by Google

an inordinate love of notoriety. Some of the strange doctrines which are put forth in our times have no other aim than to draw public attention towards their vain authors. Of them we may say, as did Jesus of the pompous professors of his day, "verily they have their reward." We ought to mention here that many minds are suffered to rest in a fit condition to be moved by the lightest breath of skepticism. Too indolent to read or think for themselves, upon religious matters, they become so morally imbecile that they are disturbed and swayed by every counter-current of infidelity. Such constitute the straws and feathers which rise in every whirlwind that is excited in community. While they remain, the wildest fanatic can gain his proselytes and raise his excitement.

Having glanced at some of the most prominent causes of the prevailing skepticism, we are now better prepared to decide upon the course most proper to be pursued with regard to it. May the remarks which follow be characterized by that degree of modesty which I ought to possess in view of the importance of my subject.

1. As the false claims which Christians have assumed for the Bible is one cause of the prevalent skepticism of our day, it becomes our duty to remove this cause by presenting the *actual* claims of that sacred book. Hitherto we have written little concerning them. We have not put forth any extended and connected views upon this important topic. We receive the same Bible which more ancient sects have accepted as the only sure foundation of a religious faith. But *how* have we received it? Or, in other words, do we regard it, *in all respects*, as it has been, and is regarded by them? Do our views of its inspiration, and of the relative importance of different books and of the relation of the Old Testament to the New, accord with theirs? If not, if we cherish more liberal and correct views upon these subjects, it is manifestly our duty to publish those views. For it is the false opinions which have been put forth respecting the Bible's claims that have provoked the attacks of infidelity. And until a sounder and more rational position is taken with respect to these claims, skepticism will annoy the Christian's faith.

As a sect we have been characterized by the distinctness with which we have set forth certain great *doctrines*

Digitized by Google

of the Bible. Is it not necessary that we treat the important topics referred to above with equal distinctness? that we be equally explicit respecting the *claims* of the Bible? Let this be done by some of our sound biblical scholars, and a pressing want will be supplied; and, if skeptics are not reclaimed, the unsettled faith of many may be established. Every conversation which I have held with those who are inclined to skepticism, has resulted in deepening the conviction above expressed; and I can but hope that, at no distant day, some one qualified to treat upon the claims of the Bible — its inspiration, — and upon other kindred topics, in a manner accordant with our rational and liberal religion, will furnish the desideratum.

2. Practice inconsistent with the requirements of the gospel has been named as another cause of skepticism. All will admit that a life in conformity with the requirements of the gospel must be a perfect life; and it would seem to be quite an easy matter to determine those requirements, and to make their application in matters of practice. The only difficulty to be apprehended would consist in resisting the temptations which would lead us counter to them. But if we examine the history of Christendom, we shall discover that the plain precepts of our religion have too frequently been disregarded or misunderstood. For, in all ages of the church, when popular views have been denounced, and the precepts of the gospel cited to prove their incompatibility with the Christian profession, an attempt has been made to explain away their force or to deny their applicability. Two causes have contributed to this end. The first exists in the fact that Christians have bestowed more attention upon doctrinal than upon practical matters — they have sought to perfect the faith more than the lives of men. Under such circumstances, it was very natural that too little importance should be attached to the moral precepts of the gospel. — A harsh and partial theology has furnished the second cause to which I have alluded. Such a theology illy accorded with the mild precepts of Christianity. By its pernicious influence it has shrunk the affections and sympathies of men, and thus unfitted them for perceiving the catholic spirit which underlies these precepts, and which imparts to them their vitality. It is not strange that

Digitized by Google

those whose sympathies and love have been dwarfed by such a partial theology should be unable to understand those rules of life which arise out of impartial truths, and are applicable to an universal brotherhood. As the precepts of Christianity are legitimate deductions from its truths, of course, those who misapprehend these truths are thereby disqualified for comprehending the precepts which are but sequences from them. For instance; if, with me, it is a Christian doctrine that my enemy is a totally depraved being, and is consequently an object of God's infinite hatred, it will be impossible for me to understand literally that precept which requires that I should love my enemy.

It is evident that while the causes above named continue to operate, Christians will be more theoretical than practical, and their lives will be far below the requirements of the gospel of Christ. While they exist, therefore, skepticism will be furnished with supplies. We have the ability to remove these causes. To our minds have been unfolded those liberal, impartial features which characterize the religion of Jesus. By the light which we enjoy we behold in God a loving Father, and in man an equal brother. We have learned that we are so linked together, and our interests so identified that, "whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." We are thus prepared by the truths which we have received, rightly to understand the precepts which accompany them. And having learned, also, that Christianity was given to teach us to deny ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in *this present world*, we are exempt from the dominion of that error respecting the object of Christianity which has blinded other sects to its practicalness. Let us, therefore, exercise the ability which we possess, and seek to remove one of the most prolific causes of skepticism by applying our religion to daily life. Up to the present period we have been forced, by the pressure of circumstances, to be doctrinal in our efforts. The demolition of old systems of error, and the planting of our new and better doctrines, was the first work to be done. This our fathers have nobly prosecuted, and their success has made it our duty to develope

Digitized by Google

in the individual life the results which our religion is calculated to produce, and thus carry forward to completion the work for which they prepared and which they began. They cleared up the wilderness, and planted the good seed of the kingdom. It is now our duty to cultivate the plants which have shot upward so luxuriantly, and to ripen upon them genuine Christian fruit. Our labors, therefore, should be practical. It should be our aim to bring Christendom and the world up to the moral standard of our religion. When this is done, skepticism will have no foothold upon earth.

When I say that our labors should be practical, I do not mean that we should cease to proclaim the doctrines of our religion, and talk only of its precepts. No! these doctrines must be kept constantly before the minds of men. Without them, the precepts would lose their significance and power. Sunlight is necessary to unfold the blade from the seed which has been sown. It is equally necessary to develope the ear, and to ripen the full corn in the ear. So gospel doctrine is requisite to the first developement from the germ of Christian principle; and is equally essential to the growth of the graces of a perfected character.

Would we remove one of the most prominent causes of skepticism? then we must be willing to apply our religion to all existing evils, and to aim at their removal. Infidelity will defy us so long as we seek to justify the giant sins of the age, or shrink from an earnest conflict with them. Were we to present to the world the spectacle of a Christian sect thoroughly baptized into the spirit, and acting in perfect accordance with the precepts of our religion, we should forever silence the cavils of infidelity. Let it be our aim to occupy such a position, and to produce such a result.

3. Besides the causes of skepticism above considered, there are conditions of mind predisposed to its influence. A love of novelty or excitement, ignorance, mental instability — these render the mind which they characterize, an easy dupe of clamorous infidelity. Such minds have found their way into our pulpits, and have exerted that influence with which the place is invested. It therefore becomes our duty to guard against such evils. This we can

Digitized by Google

do by raising the standard of ministerial education and character. Until this is done our ministry will contain material which skepticism can readily sway to its own caprices. Our growth as a denomination has been so rapid that there has existed a constant and pressing demand for laborers in the vineyard. Anxious to meet this demand, our ordaining councils have not always observed that caution which the interests of our cause demanded, and some have been inducted into the sacred office who were illy qualified for the responsible position. They did not possess that learning and mental discipline requisite to grapple successfully with the cavils of skepticism. They lacked the essential ballast of information, and the anchor of strong original thought, and were tossed upon the waves of social excitement like an empty and anchorless ship upon a troubled sea. While such are inducted into the pastoral office, infidelity will not lack for agents with which to prosecute her purposes. She will find them in the ranks of the Christian ministry, invested with its far-reaching influence. It becomes our duty, therefore, to raise the standard of ministerial education and character. Is it too much to hope that the recent exhibitions we have had of the ease with which some minds are unbalanced and drawn from the moorings of Christian faith, will rouse us from that lethargy respecting our educational interests, which has too long been our characteristic.

4. It is our duty to define the faith essential to Christian fellowship, and to be governed by our definition in all matters appertaining to fellowship.

This duty arises out of the claims of Christianity, and the exigencies of the times. Christianity claims to be a special revelation from heaven; this claim is put forth upon nearly every page of the New Testament; and the attention of the most superficial reader is arrested by it. To deny this claim, therefore, is equivalent to pronouncing Jesus Christ an imposter or fanatic, and, of course, unworthy our confidence. Further; To deny this claim to divine authority, is to deny the most essential characteristic of Christianity, and to place it upon a level with the philosophies of the world. But such denial is made by those who demand Christian fellowship. Can they be ministers of Jesus, in the proper sense of the term, whilst

Digitized by Google

they deny him the character and authority which he claimed? If not, then a necessity exists for defining the faith essential to Christian fellowship.

The impropriety of such demand, on their part, is so manifest, that it would seem hardly necessary to argue against it; but as there are conscientious minds which have not discovered this impropriety, it may not be out of place to endeavor to give it a clear exposition.

Composing our confederacy are twenty-nine distinct and independent states. Each of these states has its own peculiar constitution. Each of these constitutions differs, in some respects, from all the others. Besides, the immediate interests of these states are not identical, and, of course, they are not agreed upon all legislative questions. But they all agree in one thing — in recognizing the *supremacy of the Constitution of the Confederacy.* This is the bond by which they are all united. Now, suppose that one state should renounce the authority of this common bond and should exalt its own constitution above it. Would it not, by this act, sever itself from the confederacy of states? And if so, could it rightly claim the name and fellowship to which it was entitled when a member of the confederacy? Certainly not.

Let us apply our simile. The common bond by which all the differing Christian sects, and by which all individual Christians with their infinite variety of opinions, are united, is the authority of the Bible in all matters appertaining to religious faith. All receive Christ as an authoritative teacher sent from God. But suppose a sect appears which denies the authority of the Bible and of Christ. It thus plants itself above, and independent of, the common bond by which all sects have been united. Does it not, by this act, as effectually disfellowship itself from the fraternity of sects, as did the state, under the circumstances supposed, disfellowship itself from the confederacy? While trampling upon the common bond of sects, can it rightfully claim the name and fellowship which arise out of a recognition of that bond? No: no more than the state I have supposed, could claim of the other twenty-eight, that fellowship which is incidental to their bond of union. The name is limited by the bond which is recognized, and the fellowship is a necessary consequence of that recogni-

Digitized by Google

tion. In view of this fact, we say that he who rejects the common bond of Christians by denying the authority of the Bible and of Jesus Christ, is not entitled to fellowship under that bond. If he solicits it, he asks for that which he would throw away. A parallel to such procedure is furnished by certain mendicants, who to excite our pity and obtain a more ample charity, will ask for bread, it being their intention when out of our presence, to cast it to the dogs.

The Scriptures claim to contain a revelation from God. A recognition of this claim is the bond by which Christian sects are united. It is because this claim has been denied by those who demand Christian fellowship that it becomes our duty distinctly to define the faith essential to such fellowship.

The object of this faith may be inferred from remarks already made. That object is the Bible. An acceptance of this, as containing a revelation from God, should be made indispensably requisite to Christian fellowship; for it claims a divine authority; and a recognition of it has hitherto been the common bond of Christian sects. We ask for no other test of fellowship than this: but this we must insist upon. Take this away, and Christian sects would fall apart, and crumble into individual atoms; and Christianity, shorn of its divine authority and sanctions, would blend in with the vain philosophies of the age.

Such a test of fellowship is essential to consistent and successful Christian effort. Sects are organizations around essential Christian truths, having for their object the salvation of men through their application. Their power arises in part out of their concert of action; and this concert of action results from unity of faith. Suppose, now, the members of a sect are united in the belief that the divine authority of Christianity must be recognized before men can be made to feel its power and be saved by it from their iniquities. Could they consistently receive into their fellowship those who denied that authority? If fellowship were granted to such, could there any longer be concert of action? Would not those who denied the authority of Christianity counteract the efforts of those who asserted it? Would not such a body of men neutralize their own efforts? Alas! they would succeed no better in their endeavor to elevate man from his sinful condition

Digitized by Google

than did the individual who attempted to raise himself in a basket by lifting at the ears, while standing within it. Poor fellow, he did not know that the harder he lifted, the greater the weight which he had to raise!

I am aware that I am now treading upon haunted ground. Here linger, in the opinion of many, the ghosts of long "Articles of Faith," and pompous "Creeds;" and I fancy that before such, with the apparitions of bigoted synods and councils, they already arise. But let us not be frightened, for they are only *ghosts;* and we would be the last to call them back to life. All the creed that we demand is the Bible; and what Christian will deny us this? Are we not prepared to adopt this as our creed, and to make a belief in its authority a test of fellowship? If not, then let us be honest, and admit that Christianity is but an indefinite religious philosophy, and that its founder was a fanatic or impostor.

This prejudice against creeds probably arises out of their abuse, in past ages of the church. But let us learn to discriminate between the use and the abuse of a thing. Bad political constitutions have been framed and palmed upon states. Shall we, therefore, pronounce against all constitutions? This cry against creeds has become quite too popular. It is often sounded by those who wish to be considered liberal. A Christian, or a Christian sect without a creed! Why, a creed properly defines what is believed respecting Christianity. To say that we have no creed, is equivalent to saying, that we have no faith in the gospel. To deny the utility of a creed, is to acknowledge that Christianity reveals no universal truths essential to salvation. This outcry against creeds we regard as detrimental to the interests of our religion. It is an indirect protest against its claims to divine authority; and one effect of it is to pave the way to skepticism. It reaches the same deleterious result in another way — by divesting faith of its importance and worth. It has already become quite a common remark, "that it makes no difference what a man believes, if his life is only right." Now, this remark is founded upon a fundamental error — the error that a right life is independent of the energy of a Christian faith; or, in other words, that a right faith is not essential to a right life. The reverse of this is true. A

Digitized by Google

Christian faith *is* essential to a Christian life. That it was thus regarded by Christ and his apostles must be evident to the most careless student of the New Testament. Religious faith is that inward energy by which the divinest powers of the soul are developed. A Christian faith is the power by which Christian character is projected. A Christian life, independent of a gospel faith, would be an effect without a cause. Am I told that there are good moral men in community who belong to no sect and possess no faith in Christianity? I admit it. But they are greatly indebted for their morality to the good social influences by which they are surrounded. They are moral, not by virtue of any inward energy of goodness, but by virtue of good social influences. Are the lives of such essentially Christian? Do you hold them up as exemplars? Let me show their true worth and dignity. There are two students sitting side by side, engaged in the solution of a mathematical problem which has been given them. One studies upon the problem until he understands the principles by which it may be solved. He then proceeds to its solution. The other is contented to look over his shoulder and copy his figures upon his own slate. The instructer approaches, and calls upon the first for an explanation of his mode of procedure. It is given, and the teacher is satisfied. He turns to his companion, and soon ascertains that he is ignorant of the process by which the answer is reached. He accuses him of servilely copying from the other's slate. The boy attempts to justify himself by saying that it makes no difference *how* the sum is done, provided the answer is right. Is the teacher satisfied with this reply? Does it, indeed, make no difference how the sum is done, provided the right figures are obtained in the answer? Ah! it *does* make an essential difference. The boy cannot do the sum rightly, unless he does it understandingly. And he is not a good mathematician while he is ignorant of the principles of the science, and remains a mere copyist. I liken the man who is possessed of a vital Christian faith, to the first student. The man without such a faith is like the second — a mere copyist. While he has good examples given him his actions may be moral. But remove him from such examples — surround him with adverse influ-

Digitized by Google

ences, and it will be impossible for him to solve the difficult problem of a virtuous Christian life.

Let the importance of a correct Christian faith be no longer denied. It is essential to a right life. But the corner-stone of the foundation of such a faith is the divine authority of the sacred Scriptures. It is proper then to adopt these Scriptures as our religious creed, and thus say to the world that we cannot fellowship him as a Christian minister who denies their claims to authority. This we have a right to say. It is our duty to say this; and by saying it we do no violence to Christian charity.

We would denounce no man. We would question no man's sincerity. Those who deny the authority of the Bible may be as conscientious as ourselves. All we would say is this: that those who exalt their own philosophy above Christianity are upon another foundation — upon a foundation which we believe to be erroneous; and, therefore, as honest men, we will not sanction their error, and augment its influence by giving its advocates the fellowship of our fraternity. Common honesty forbids our doing this, — our love of truth and humanity forbids it.

Will you call such a course persecution? And are they martyrs who are thereby disfellowshipped? Let us end such childish talk. Persecution, to express an honest, well-founded opinion of a neighbor's claim to our fellowship! They martyrs, whose views we cannot honestly sanction! Well, if persecution never assumes a harsher form, the millennium will not be essentially retarded by it. And if earth is never again to witness more painful martyrdoms than such experience, the era is not far in the future when tears are to be wiped from off all faces, and sorrow and crying are to flee away. Such martyrdoms excite a smile rather than a tear; and we opine that if future generations treat such martyrs no more roughly than the present, their memories will be indulged in a quiet slumber in some dusty corner, rather than be forced to stand exposed in a niche of the Temple of Fame. C. H. F.

Digitized by Google

Art. XVIII.

1. *Omnipresence of the Deity.*

FROM THE GERMAN OF SCHALLER.

O, my God, thy presence near me
Everywhere, I feel and see!
In each voice of Nature, hear Thee —
Every thing is full of Thee!
Thou art where in yon blue heaven
Sun and moon alternate glow;
Where the humblest flowrets blow,
As amid the stars of even.
Everywhere I hear and see
Tokens, O, my God, of Thee!

Where the breeze the forest bendeth,
Where the golden harvest waves,
Where the tempest howls and rendeth,
Where the woodland fountain laves,
Where the mighty ocean swelleth,
Where the mountain torrent roars,
Where the meadow brooklet pours,
Where the dewdrop gently welleth;
Everywhere I hear and see
Tokens, O, my God, of Thee!

Thou art where the crashing thunder
Rocks the valley and the hill,
And, the evening shadows under,
Floats thy breath around me still.
Loftiest height and vale most lowly,
Every rock and desert bare,
Water, fire, the earth and air,
All proclaim thy presence holy!
Everywhere I hear and see
Tokens, O, my God, of Thee!

Where from Thee, Lord, could I hide me?
Thou who'rt in my inmost heart!
Thou, O, Thou wert still beside me,
Should I from the world depart!
From thy sight what deep could cover?
Could the heavens? — Lo, Thou art there!
Could the deep earth? — Thou art there!
Is there nought will not discover?
Nought, O nought! — ah, be I where
I may, my God, Thou still art there!

Digitized by Google

To the caves of ocean fleeing,
Veiled from Thee might I remain?
Nay, Omnipotent, — All-Seeing —
Thou wouldst bring me forth again.
Though the midnight darkness fold me,
Still thine eye is over me;
Midnight is as day to Thee!
And thy strong right hand would hold me!
Nought from Thee, O God, can hide me,
Everywhere Thou 'rt still beside me!

Though the hills and rocks should o'er me
Fall, and hem me all around,
Though the wings of morning bore me
To Creation's furthest bound,
Where old chaos, still unbroken,
Broodeth till the day of doom!
Thou couldst speak me from that tomb,
As the dawn from night is spoken.
Nought from Thee, O God, can hide me!
Everywhere Thou 'rt still beside me!

Teach me, O my God, then teach me,
This eternal truth to see,
That thine eye, thine arm can reach me
Wheresoever I may be!
Guide me, too, my Maker, guide me,
Ever more in virtue's way,
And, should I in error stray,
Bring me forth and walk beside me;
Be my path, or how or where,
O my God, be with me there! C. M. S.

2. *Beauty unheeded and unheeding.*

Earth spreads her beauties with a lavish hand;
She hoards not up, a day beyond its time,
The bud's fresh loveliness, and keeps not back
The green, up-springing shoot from the small seed
She bore within her warm life-giving breast.
Earth waits no festive gala-day to shower
Her beauties round; but whether eye of man
Beholds, or nought but the pure skies looks down,
Still the same beautiful perfection reigns,
Day after day, forever 'neath our eyes.

And every day the sun pursues his course.
He tarries never at the eastern gates,
That mortal eyes may wait his coming forth,

Digitized by Google

He pauses never at the noontide hour,
And at his setting turns not back, but clouds
Gorgeous and fitting for a monarch's train,
Wait on the king of day, and never ask
If mortal eyes behold their glorious pomp.
And ever following day, the silent night,—
Ever the stars keep their lone watch in heaven.
They bend above the ocean's vast expanse,
They gleam upon Arabia's desert sands,
Where, it may be, no eye beholds their light,
But just as clear and steadily they shine
Upon this solitude, as o'er the haunts
Of busy men, and cities' crowded life;
As kindly bend they o'er the savage wild,
Where watches nature's free untutored son
Their coming forth to guide his steps along
The forest paths, as o'er the lofty dome
Which science rears, and where pale students watch,
And sage astronomers seek, with their intense,
Clear, telescopic eyes, new light in heaven,
And fain would solve with learning's magic ray
The mysteries of that world, which ever moves
In its perfected beauty calm and still,
A glorious pageant, free alike to all.

Beauty is all around us, yet we pass
With quick unheeding steps along the path
Of life. Nature's grand panorama moves
Before us, and we gaze, and give no thought
To its celestial loveliness. The flowers
Bloom ever, and the earth's green carpet spreads
Beneath our feet. Ever the soft winds blow,
Ever on earth and sea; in cloud and sky,
In heaven's broad arch in starry characters,
Is written, *Every thing is beautiful!*
And yet, what heed all things that God hath made
So beautiful, of our regard? The stars
Pine never for our notice. Day goes on
And waiteth not for our command. Flowers bloom,
Trees grow, where mortal foot hath never trod.
And where a million eyes watch for the sun,
And bend adoringly to hail his beams,—
He riseth with no more of pomp, than where
No eye but hers who tearful watched all night
Beside the dead, looks on his coming forth.

Beauty is round us, but it waiteth not
For man's approval. If his heart is dead
And sees it not, his is the only loss.
Woe for the heart that sees nought beautiful
On earth, and sorrow for the soul that looks
Abroad upon the world and heedeth not
Its loveliness.

N. T. M.

Digitized by Google

3. *The Deep.*

"To thee the love of woman hath gone down:
Dark flow thy tides o'er manhood's noble head;
O'er youth's bright locks and beauty's flowery crown,
Yet must thou hear a voice,— restore the dead!
Earth shall reclaim her precious things from thee.
Restore the dead, thou sea."—HEMANS.

O, THOU blue Ocean stretching far away
To Earth's far borders and most distant isles;
Now tossing free thy wild and foamy spray,
Now clad with peace, or mirroring sunlit smiles!
O what hast thou, thou canst to us bequeath,
Bosomed far down thy restless waves beneath?

Thou hast bright gems, whose worth is all untold,
Beaming unnumbered on thy golden sands;
And rainbow shells, whose hues no eyes behold,
Sleep in thy depths, and on thy tide-washed strands.
Earth's wealth regardless thou dost deem thy spoil,
And mock'st man's pride unmindful of his toil.

O'er nameless cities thou dost roll thy billow,
And antique fanes are hid beneath thy wave;
Beauty, and Pride, and Might have found a pillow
Upon thy sands, and in thy depths a grave.
The young, the old, the lovely thou hast press'd:
Manhood and beauty sleep beneath thy breast.

We ask not for thy treasures, O thou Sea;
We ask not for thy gold nor for thy shells,
We ask not fanes, nor cities that in thee
Oblivion mantles, and no history tells.
O keep of such, all thou hast overthrown;
Yield but those things we claim to be our own!

Yield to our arms again the lost and loved!
Give up the dear ones and the souls enshrined!
Give up the things by fond affection proved,
Whose hidden forms thy watery sheet doth wind!
Our hearts are desolate. Their memories stay
Around our hearthstones: Where, O where are they!

No voice comes from thee, awe-inspiring Ocean,
Save the low murmurs of thy rocking wave;
Nor see we aught, save thy dark billowy motion,
Heaving sublime o'er many a hidden grave.
Earth's loved ones thou hath claimed for thine and thee;
Thou deign'st no answer, O thou mighty Sea.

Digitized by Google

So let them sleep. When time shall be no more,
The archangel, bending from yon azure sky,
With the last trump shall shake thy farthest shore,
And thou obey the voice of destiny.
Then thy pale corses thou no more shalt keep,
But yield each lost and loved one, O thou Deep!

E. C. JR.

Art. XIX.

Theology and Literature.

The age in which we live differs in many important respects from all ages preceding. It would, perhaps, be difficult to indicate all the points of dissimilarity, for many of them are too slight to be distinguished except in the altered expression of the whole. As the differences in the individual countenance are the result of a minute shading of the several features, so are the characteristics of periods of human history produced by causes that elude our most vigilant investigation. Yet is the fact no less apparent that the spirit of each age is essentially different. The various classes of men are thus placed in altered relations to each other. It is, therefore, necessary that every institution should be critically examined at different periods, its nature and uses newly defined, and its true position in society be indicated.

No profession has more sensibly felt the transforming influence of the spirit of our age than theology. The minister of Christianity can never occupy his former position. The wants of society now call for new duties, and lead him into many new paths. His word is no longer law, his peculiarities of temperament and his prejudices can no longer be received as a portion of the system of religion he teaches. He no longer stands upon the confines of two worlds, where the light of the present and the shadow of the future blend in a medium of indistinctness, increasing his proportions, and giving to him the

Digitized by Google

vague outlines of a supernatural being. He has stepped into broad day on our side of the line, and is seen to be a man like ourselves. He has been compelled to renounce the honors and privileges of a god, while he has assumed all the complicated relations of brother and fellow-worker in our earthly existence.

This change in his position demands a corresponding change in his preparatory mental discipline. Once he was the lawgiver, and only a knowledge of the law was essential. A professional acquaintance with the Scriptures was his education. Now he has descended into the region of humanity, where his Biblical lore is unmanageable unless united with human learning. A breadth of culture is demanded of him exceeding that of any former age. Science and philosophy, the history of nations, and the highest literature of the world, once despised as the wisdom of man, must now be adopted, and assimilated into his mental constitution.

The relation existing between Theology and Literature, therefore, becomes a matter of vast importance. We propose, at this time, to offer a few thoughts concerning it.

And first, it may be remarked that analogy demands such a connection. All subjects of human investigation are intimately related to each other. Science is but a knowledge of the *relations* of physical substances and powers; concerning the things themselves its ignorance is complete. An extended observation in the material universe increases our wonder at this subtle union of all its parts. The grain of sand upon the sea-shore is connected in numberless ways with all created things, from the spray that flies above it, to the remotest planet, laboring in its tedious journey around the sun. No individual can be accurately known, unless all its relations are taken into account. And even more remarkable is the operation of this law in the world of ideas. The most trivial subject of inquiry, if pursued with a desire for truth, enlarges itself, assumes new aspects, is modified at every stage of investigation by the presence of some kindred subject, until the wearied student confesses that, to understand it, he must embrace the complete circle of knowledge and possibility. We know there are men who pretend to be thoroughly instructed in one branch of human inquiry, but their con-

Digitized by Google

fidence only betrays their ignorance, for it is the result of a wilful neglect of all other topics that lie adjacent to the favorite object of their research. The naturalist may look at the wing of a fly, through a microscope, until it appears to him the most stupendous thing in creation, and his notion will be as reasonable as his who thinks he can fence off any portion of the world of ideas, inspect it, and exhaust its meaning in a life of continued labor.

This fact, which we suppose no one will dispute, assumes the first importance when applied to our subject. Theology, considered in itself, is the sublimest field of human investigation. It is the science that treats of the nature and attributes of God, and of our relations to him. It becomes, therefore, the goal at which all intellectual striving must repose. Every other subject is important only as it is related to this, for to know and sérve God, and to develope our spiritual natures, is the sum of all knowledge, and the purpose of our creation. If, then, the most ordinary topic involves considerations the most extended, what shall we say of this, resting, as it does, at the summit of things? Certainly that its relations are infinite; that to be well known, it must be seen in all its vast connections. It elevates every inferior object of inquiry, therefore must its influence be traced through the circle of human knowledge. It is, in turn, modified by the efforts of the human understanding, and, therefore, must these be examined, and all their effects carefully noted. Thus viewed, all subjects of investigation will unite in one great system of truth, beneath which we may stand, gazing reverently upward, as we look toward the vault of heaven at midnight, when the full moon mingles her light with the rays of the stars, and the firmament seems bound together in beautiful and harmonious union!

We shall not attempt to indicate all, or many, of the relations that theology sustains to literature. A few of the most apparent will be noticed, but different illustrations will occur to every thoughtful mind. Let us then pass in rapid review three of the great subjects of human inquiry, — Science, Philosophy, and Poetry, — pausing long enough before each to show that its power is derived from this, and that its energies flow back in turn to the source of its strength.

Digitized by Google

We suppose no one will deny the existence of the connection between theology and science. The history of the church bears testimony to this in its record of the long-continued feud between the naturalists and the theologians. The fact, that scientific theories and religious creeds have been so often found in a hostile attitude to each other, proves, at least, that there is an important relation between them. In this contest the censure must fall upon both parties. It cannot be denied that many of the scientific theories of ancient and modern times have been of atheistic tendency, sometimes from errors of investigation, but as frequently from a secret hostility in their inventors towards the truths of religion. In the effort to place science upon an independent basis, its disciples have sometimes forgotten that he who renounces the great religious ideas that lie at the foundation of our mental and moral existence, does not thereby qualify himself for impartial investigation, but rather cuts himself off from all communication with the truth. In no pursuit can a man succeed by the efforts of the intellect alone. The united force of all the faculties can alone wrest the secret from any mystery about us. It must also be confessed that the church has often stood across the path of advancing science. The astronomer, the navigator, the chemist, and the geologist, have in turn been unjustly denounced as the enemies of Scripture and religion. Even now a shudder runs through a portion of the church at every new revelation from the material universe. It would, however, be easy to show that this hostility is foreign to the spirit of Christianity. In fact, during the earlier periods of ecclesiastical history, the followers of the reigning science and philosophy were in the same attitude towards the disciples of the new religion. Our faith struggled into a vigorous manhood against the unscrupulous opposition of the cultivated classes of society. The cause of this in either case lies not in any legitimate tendency of science or Christianity, but in the influence of power long possessed to make the best men intolerant. We believe the world is improving in this respect, yet even now nature is studied by cold and skeptical men, and a few biblical scholars are still found, the forlorn hope of decaying creeds, who with arguments drawn from the cosmogony of Moses and the

Digitized by Google

poetry of Job, stoutly resist the conclusions of modern science.

But why must this process, so disgraceful to religion and science, be repeated in every period of ecclesiastical history? We cannot believe that science and revelation are necessarily opposed. On the contrary, they harmonize. Both are, in a certain sense, communications from the Deity; the former, that portion of truth which God yields to the patient efforts of mental labor; the latter, the highest facts of our moral nature and destiny, with which inspired men are commissioned to enlighten our ignorance. The one may be higher up the scale than the other, yet a part of the same infinite system of knowledge. One is as necessary in its place as the other. If they appear hostile to each other, either our science is uncertain, or our principles of scriptural interpretation unsound. In the struggles of the past the error has perhaps been equally divided. The natural philosophers have had their visions and dreams, and the theologians have been accustomed to overlay the word of God with the traditions of men, yet no one can deny that science has indirectly influenced the church in a great degree.

One method of this influence has been by proving the fallacy of erroneous interpretation of the Bible, an evil yet of great magnitude. While contending for the Scriptures, we are often contending for some fancy of our own. We "*read into*" books often more than we take from them. And especially if a series of works, extending through ages, written by many different individuals in different stages of religious culture, is subjected to a system of relentless verbal interpretation, it will not be difficult for ignorance, superstition, or folly, to find anything therein. The perusal of the Bible is beset with difficulties. So much has been written and said about it, it has lain for so many ages buried under a load of creeds and commentaries, our habit of careless reading has so familiarized, or rather vulgarized its heavenly doctrines and expression, that it is next to impossible to read it to-day as a fresh work. Its words suggest to us, not the ideas of the writers, but the notions of our fathers, our mothers, and our ministers. Thus we are often found waging a furious contest against heresy, while, in fact, we are sustaining a

Digitized by Google

doctrine that Christ and his apostles would be little disposed to acknowledge.

In view of this condition of things, the great value of independent scientific investigation appears. Such a process of inquiry often leads the student of nature up to the very face of some theological dogma. He cannot proceed until it is trampled under his feet. Science has advanced from one triumph to another over the corpses of slain creeds. Galileo was overthrown in such a conflict, but his truth did not kneel before the Romish Church; and long and doubtful has, in our day, been the strife between Genesis and Geology. Yet every shock thus given to theology has delivered it from some burden of tradition. It is true, the method is violent, but the disease is desperate. It is better that all the false religion in the world should perish, than that one guide upon the road to heaven should be obscured. How far this process will continue is, of course, uncertain. But it is probable that many creeds are yet to be shaken by facts which no wilful blindness can long neglect. It then becomes every man who would win respect for himself and his faith, to encourage the scientific tendencies of the age, and before he pronounces any new theory unscriptural in its tendency, to examine it deliberately, and review his own position in the theological world. He who will do this, confers an incalculable service upon religion, and saves himself the humiliation of joining that company of departed ecclesiastics, of whom history can only say, "They resisted the truth, and perished."

Another important relation of science is its connection with natural religion. It is feared by many that late discoveries will weaken the confidence of men in revelation. But we apprehend no danger from this; the same Deity aids us by means natural and supernatural, implanting in the soul the germs of religious truth, strengthening the intellect to perceive everywhere in nature traces of himself, and giving to Jesus "the spirit without measure" to instruct us in things beyond our sight. The truths of natural religion are necessary to the comprehension of revelation. They are assumed in Christianity. The latter is supplementary to the former. The authority of both is equal. One we cannot deny without a skepticism

Digitized by Google

that would dissolve our existence; the other we accept on the strength of historical proof, confirming all our higher intuitions. It is as if in the ascent to heaven, at the point where our path was enveloped in shadows, a bright light should stream upon it, revealing a gradual and widening passage to the throne of God!

It would be interesting to indicate the several truths of religion to which modern science has imparted new vitality. Our limits forbid us, however, to notice more than a single instance which illustrates the method, and stands in this respect for a large class. We will select the doctrine of God's omnipresence.

It is evident that in proportion as this truth is strongly or feebly impressed upon the soul, will be the character of its religion. It is the great point of difference between a spiritual and naturalistic theology. The one banishes the Deity to a remote corner of the universe, where he directs the worlds only secondarily by his laws, and communicates his will to man only by few persons, and at distant periods. The other sees in laws the immediate action of God, and believes that the human soul is constantly receiving influences from the Infinite Spirit according to its purity and capacity. The practical results of these systems of belief are widely different. The one encourages virtue by the assurance of God's actual presence and providential care over every creature. It consecrates life, and annihilates a mischievous longing for the future, by the conviction that heaven may be enjoyed in this earthly state of being. It delivers us from the slavery of circumstances, by impressing the soul with a consciousness of being near its Father, — a truth before which all other events fall into comparative insignificance. The other, teaching, at best, the omnipresence of Deity through the agency of laws, leaves the soul in the presence of mechanical forces, and robs it of the cheering assurance of the Creator's protection. To the eye of a critical theology this may seem a trifling distinction, but to the heart of the Christian there is in it a separation wide as the difference to the mind of the child between the actual presence of a parent, and the reception of gifts from him while far away, through the hands of agents however faithful.

Now, we believe that modern scientific inquiry tends

Digitized by Google

directly to establish this doctrine. It points everywhere to order. The minutest object in nature obeys its laws with no less precision than the greatest. This fact needs no illustration, as it is known to every student. But herein, it is thought, lies the *atheistic* tendency of our science. It is said that the universe is thus given over to the reign of laws, and God is banished from his creation. We do not wonder that men, in whose theology the Deity only stands afar off behind all his machinery of natural forces, are frightened at these new developements. Every extension of law drives their God farther away, until he recedes from their straining sight, and they are left alone in the awful solitude. The only method of avoiding such a conclusion, is to reject this old figment of the law as a mediator between the Creator and his universe, and acknowledge the actual presence of the Deity, producing by his own will those results we ascribe to gravity, heat, electricity, and the thousand other names we have adopted to hide our ignorance of the efficient causes. Modern science has brought our theology to a crisis in this point, and presented to it the startling alternative of spiritualism or atheism. The same may be said of other truths of religion — the unity and benevolence of God, and the immortality of spirit.

Here, then, is a connection sufficiently intimate to elevate science to the highest claim upon our attention. It is a test of false interpretation, and it strengthens the fundamental ideas of all religion. And it is raised and redeemed from its materialistic tendency by the influence of theology. Science without religious direction, leads to atheism. Religion without science, degenerates to superstition. United, they mutually chasten and refresh each other, sanctifying the material universe by the presence of God, and giving to the world of ideas a permanence like that of the mountains and the sky. The man of science, who scorns theology, is but a maker of catalogues and collector of specimens. The theologian, however learned, who rejects science, but a philological inquisitor, who places ancient words upon his rack or in his fires, to ascertain how much they will confess!

The relation of Philosophy to theology next demands our attention. In the ascending scale of culture this naturally follows science. The labor of the psychologist

Digitized by Google

differs from that of the naturalist rather in the objects than the method of investigation. He classes mental phenomena, endeavors to learn their connection with each other, with the material universe and their Creator. According to the extent and precision of this examination will be his philosophic theory concerning the highest questions that propose themselves to the mind of man. It will at once be seen that such researches are nearly concerned with our religious interests. The soul of man, its origin, its duty and destiny, is the subject of inquiry in either case. Philosophy is in her proper element while endeavoring to explain the faith, or want of faith, in the soul. But men are never weary of tearing asunder things united by God. The same low prejudices which have unsuccessfully contended against science, are found arrayed against philosophic culture. "Philosophy imperfect, Christianity perfect," is the motto of one class of divines, who look with suspicion upon the questioning spirit of modern times; a motto faultless in itself, yet as we shall see, not capable of strict application in the case at point. Or, we are told by others that no hostility is cherished against a true religious philosophy; a declaration which not unfrequently amounts to this, that the only true philosophy is that which sanctions the form of Christian faith adopted by those who utter it. Thus men use their peculiar religious opinions, as the test of all philosophical speculations, and their boasted employment of reason is only a brisk warfare of dialectics to sustain them. We have more respect for a man who scorns philosophical culture, than for him who thus makes his intellect only a sentinel to guard the outposts of his creed. The one disowns reason, the other disgraces it.

This maxim, "Christianity perfect, Philosophy imperfect," belongs to a class which, though true in the abstract, are yet a constant source of confusion in our religious discussions. A very important element in the case is overlooked. Few will dispute the fact that the religion of Jesus is perfect, but it is a question admitting of some discussion whether it is so, *as comprehended by the mind of any man.* The opponents of philosophy entirel y neglect this distinction. They assume that the order of religious ideas is the same in their souls as in the

Digitized by Google

soul of Christ. But judging from the vast dissimilarity in the creeds of the churches, we must conclude that all are not complete. Yet all openly claim perfection, or unconsciously assume it. But religious infallibility is like the ball or ring with which Signor Blitz astonishes the spectators of his performance. It is never found where you look for it, but passes from one place to another in such rapid succession that it may as well be a thousand miles away, as far as any rational purpose is concerned. While we examine the boasted perfection of any creed, it resolves itself into some mixture of divine and human ingredients; but there is always one calling to us, "come up hither, and we will show you the truth."

Now, so far is any man from actually embracing the whole of Christianity, that we think the religious creed of every one is only the measure of his philosophy. Each human being lives in a spiritual atmosphere, composed of his reasonings, prejudices, and observations. Every thing is seen through this medium. By it character and manners are judged, tastes are formed, and employments directed. And a man's religion is only so much of Christianity as comes within the sweep of his horizon. Doctrines that are included in his philosophical system he recognizes. All others he is incapable of discerning, or if they are seen, it is at an angle of vision that distorts their proportions, and gives to them the appearance of error. We do not say that every man deliberately forms a system of philosophy, and then accommodates his religion to it. On the contrary, most are unconscious of possessing any system. It is the growth of all experience, formed by gradual accumulations of knowledge, partial reasoning, scraps of theories, and ideas obtained everywhere, from the nursery to the close of life. It comprises all the intellectual furniture. It is so much of a man that he has not enough else to see it by. If the attempt is made to examine it, a thousand characteristic features escape notice. We cannot know our own mental condition which forms our theory of the universe. Other men can look in upon us, and see the strangely compounded system, resembling those country mansions where the ancestral dwelling has been enlarged upon the marriage of each son or daughter, until the whole pile will vie with the Cretan labyrinth in its

Digitized by Google

recesses and intricate windings. This fact accounts for the innumerable forms Christianity assumes. The same words awaken different ideas and associations in different minds. Were Christ with us to-day, there would be divisions among his followers. The idea, then, of proposing Christianity as it exists in the minds of men, as a test of philosophical systems, is an absurdity; for we theoretically comprehend only as much of it as our philosophy will permit. All that we do when thus comparing a theory, is to place it by the side of our own theory, and write upon it truth or falsehood.

It may be objected to this reasoning that it exalts philosophy at the expense of Christianity. On the contrary, we claim for it no infallibility. The same influences that prevent our complete appreciation of the religion of Jesus, modify our philosophical opinions. He who makes his own theory of the universe the standard of Christianity, is as much in error as he who would subject philosophy to the lines of his religious creed. But is there no test of truth? Have we no intellectual basis for action? To the former question no answer can be returned which will confirm us in the assumption of infallibility. If we have flattered ourselves with the notion that the whole of Christianity or philosophy lies in just proportions in our own minds, we need the truth expressed by the conclusion that has been presented. We do not pretend that it is a complete statement of the relation existing between the soul and abstract truth, although it may be difficult to evade its force by any process of logic. Yet it represents a great fact, which should be kept in view to teach us all humility. It is impossible that it will produce skepticism in a healthy mind, for we cannot avoid confidence in our opinions sufficient for all the practical purposes of life. Of course, that portion of truth which we are permitted by our spiritual condition to comprehend, must stand for the time in place of the whole. No harm can result from faith in it, while the mind is still kept open for the reception of new ideas; and we must act from it, remembering, however, when we approach the region of dogmatism, that we are fallible.

Those reasoners, therefore, who oppose Christianity to philosophy, are only deceiving themselves. They have a philosophy which moulds their faith, but are unconscious

Digitized by Google

of it. Others claim to possess one, and try to improve it. God only knows how near any of us are to the truth, but it is not difficult to decide who will be most successful in the pursuit of it: he who scorns all philosophical culture, and contents himself with a system formed by the mental driftwood of society, borne against some rock of prejudice in his own mind, or he who labors honestly to understand the reason of the hope within him, even though he may be compelled to cry in the moments of his highest conviction, "Lord, I believe, help thou my unbelief!" Some philosophy we must have. The only question is between a philosophy of prejudice and wilful ignorance, or one which is the result of a faithful exertion of our intellectual power.

Again, many of the questions which now divide the theological world, involve philosophical considerations, as they depend for their solution upon a knowledge of the spiritual capacities of men. The contest between the rationalists and supernaturalists, between the advocates of faith without reason, and reason without faith, can only terminate when the function of each is indicated in the culture of the soul. Most subjects of doctrine at last involve the same consequences. Could the relation of the intellectual to the religious nature be ascertained, our problem of divinity would be much simplified. As it is, we dispute with no result except a greater difference of opinion, and increased bitterness of feeling. The advocates of historical Christianity view it through the medium of the understanding, making it a logical system, while their opponents, in their efforts to vindicate the higher intuitions, forget the limits imposed upon them by our earthly condition.

Thus the facts of one class of theologians are foolishness to another, being viewed from opposite poles. If both parties would seek first to obtain definite views of the native powers of the mind, their disputes would be more instructive and profitable. If unanimity of opinion did not result, we cannot but think that mutual charity might spring up, religious controversies would then be conducted by men who, by patient investigation and honest thought, had recognized the great difficulties that obscure such inquiries. Feeling their own ignorance, they would be

Digitized by Google

more anxious to appropriate the truth in the system of an opponent, than to prove him an unbeliever.

Can the human mind by its own powers discover the truths of religion? If so, are they attained by reasoning, or suggested by the affections? If not, at what point is a revelation needed, and what proof is necessary to confirm it; that addressed to the senses, or to the conscience and religious sense? Such topics can be reasonably discussed only by men who are disciplined by philosophical culture. They involve the structure of the soul, and all the highest questions of ontology. Of course, no man can hope to arrive at absolute certainty in such matters; but any true mind can obtain what is better for it than this; a conviction that what it knows or can be known, is but a point in the universe of ideas. A recognition of the mystery about us is indispensable to the successful pursuit of any train of thought. It teaches humility, and changes men from controversialists into inquirers.

The bitterest sectarian is always the man of the narrowest philosophical culture. Unaccustomed to painful thought, ignorant of the vast realm of the unknown, he assumes opinions which remain undecided in the highest courts of the understanding. He walks about, pertly setting his mark upon every new theory, and denouncing every opponent, as little qualified to pronounce any opinion as an Esquimaux fisherman to settle the rival claims of Homer, Dante and Shakspeare.

We now proceed to the last and most important of these four subjects of human comprehension,— Poetry. In the term we include all the highest literature of the imagination, whether in the form of verse or prose. This we believe to be exceeded in importance only by theology, to which it is most intimately related.

It will be seen by the place we assign to poetry, that we do not accept the popular notion of it which has been so ably stated by Macaulay. We do not believe that "a certain unsoundness of mind" is a necessary qualification of the poet. We hesitate to speak of Homer, Dante, Shakspeare, Milton and Göthe as *madmen;* on the contrary, we should be more inclined to assert that in the poetry of these men is contained the result of all human knowledge. Their intuition has perceived more than our science or

Digitized by Google

metaphysics has been able to classify. It is a fact which many men have yet to learn, that the highest truth is not obtained by the efforts of the understanding only. Even in science and metaphysics, the best thing written does not lie at the end of a process of logic, but comes suddenly to the mind, warmed and elevated by intense activity, or oftener, perhaps, in some moment of repose. The broad path of reasoning which conducts the reader to some brilliant discovery, was not the one by which the thinker ascended to it. He was caught up to his mount of vision, and when he felt himself standing on firm ground, he *built* the way by which men ascend to it. This formidable show of logic is usually an afterthought. The reasoners of the world are constantly employed in verifying to the understanding truths announced by men who *saw* them.

But if this be true in the severer sciences, how much more evident is it that the higher themes with which poetry deals are not to be approached by the mechanical operations of the understanding. The secrets of our nature, the wonderful motions of the intellectual faculties, the fathomless depths of the affections, the appearances of the material creation, and the sympathy existing between them and ourselves, the vicissitudes of human destiny, and the variegated drama of life; themes like these are too high or too subtle to be grasped by a cold logic. All we know of them is from the hints and gleams of light afforded by the poetical faculty. The Hamlet of Shakspeare reveals more facts of our spiritual nature than can be found in the books of the greatest philosophers. The novels of Göthe recall more of the minute and subtle manifestations of the intellect and affections, than the works of those who have spent their lives in investigating the mechanism and operations of the mind. Destroy the writings of the five great poets we have named, and what is left with which to replace them, considered only in their scientific value? Poetry is the highest literature, because it deals with things it most concerns us to know. It rises into regions to which the understanding cannot climb, and reveals facts which all men acknowledge to be true.

But not only does the poet give us the most valuable facts, but he creates the ideal world, which is no less real than the actual. We cannot know human nature until

Digitized by Google

we know its possibilities as well as its present condition. No man is willing to be judged by his actual life. He feels that it does not accurately represent him. It is a mutilated copy of that beautiful existence which he knows can be attained. Therefore, he who writes of man, must not only tell us what he is, but what he hopes to be, and can be. Then, by comparing his broken, disjointed condition with the symmetrical proportions of his ideal, a knowledge is obtained of his weakness and his power. Those who ridicule the representations of life and character by the poet as unreal, do not see that such pictures, though not accurate copies of any man's actual life, are an attempt to portray his best hopes and his noblest strivings. They are true to the best part of man, that portion upon which all our respect and expectation for him is founded, for our confidence in human nature does not arise from contemplating the events of life, but from the eternal craving of the soul for better things, its glowing ideal of a loftier existence, and those rare acts of heroism and beauty, in which the spirit, raised by its desires, sustains itself for a moment upon an eminence far above its ordinary level.

Thus does poetry teach the highest truth, and embody in beautiful forms the loftiest ideals of the race. While in history we have a record of the failures of man, in his attempts to realize greatness and goodness, in poetry the degrading picture is set over against the possibilities of existence. In fact, history would be intolerable were it not relieved by actions which come from the realm of the ideal and poetic; events which are remembered only because their actors burst the chains of custom, and followed an impulse that called them to a purer atmosphere. Those great deeds which men in their common moods pronounce signs of madness, are the bright points in the history of the world. No man would wander through the ruins of a great city, were he not attracted by the beauty and grandeur of some statue or temple which the destroyer had spared. And thus poetic events, shining out, at intervals, in the chronicles of our race, lead us unwearied across deserts, and over the wrecks of human power and happiness. There are two worlds; the world of our outward life, which is at best an exhibition of our

Digitized by Google

failures, and the world within, created from our aspirations, and all that is most precious to us. To the former, history; to the latter, poetry introduces us.

Would our limits permit, we should attempt to indicate the resemblance between the poetic and religious faculty. They have many things in common, belonging as they do, to the spontaneous portion of our nature. There is a sense in which we can speak of poetry as inspiration. Like the promptings of the Holy Spirit, it is "a wind" that "bloweth where it listeth" — no man can tell "whence it cometh, or whither it goeth." Yet our ignorance of things so mysterious, forbids us to pronounce an opinion. Our terms, inspiration and genius, though used so freely, are only employed to conceal our entire ignorance of the manner in which Deity communicates truth to the faculties of men. All we can say is, that the poet approaches nearer to the prophet than any other man. They both speak eternal truths which come not from themselves; but the voices which echo in the depths of their spirits, proceed out of clouds and darkness which no mortal eye can penetrate!

We shall not, therefore, attempt the difficult task of naming the characteristics of the poetical and religious faculties; but confine our remarks to the method by which a knowledge of the nature of man, acquired through the highest literature, can assist in the pursuits of theology. Christianity was given to satisfy the spiritual wants of the soul. It is a complete theory of life and morals, adapted to every emergency of social or individual experience. But to discover this adaptation, a knowledge of human nature and character is necessary. To appreciate the value of any system of religion, we must not only understand its precepts and requirements, but the object it proposes to accomplish, and the mental and moral conditions it supposes. This information we obtain from the revelations of the poet. It is often said that the poetical view of life and character is false, and can only mislead us. This may be true of the pictures of existence which are drawn by versifiers, and second-rate novelists, but it is not true of those which come from the hands of men of genius, *the* poets of the world. A little of the imaginative faculty makes a man a sentimentalist and a fool; the

Digitized by Google

possession of "the vision and the faculty divine," imparts to him the clearest insight, and the most correct view of things. Those men are not acquainted with human nature who would divest it of all its grandeur and beauty. Their judgment is formed from a survey of the misfortunes, the humiliations and the failures of the soul. These are not the materials from which to obtain a correct estimate of its powers. As reasonably might an architect attempt to write a description of St. Peter's Church, when he had examined only the weather-stains upon its outer walls. Such a critic, in his anxiety to discover minute defects, would destroy the sense of beauty in his own soul. So God sends upon religious connoisseurs, as a punishment for their uncharitableness, a suspicion of virtue, and an incapacity to be greatly moved by the noblest human examples. Instead of becoming admirers of goodness, they dwindle to critics of men, and grope about in search of faults like a man hunting for the nests of rats and the holes of snakes among the arches of the majestic Coliseum at Rome!

We have said that a knowledge of facts and possibilities is essential to a true idea of human character; and this knowledge we have in the highest literature of the imagination. We obtain our impressions of men by actual observation of ourselves and others, and through the writings of men of genius. Both methods are essential. From our own investigations we gather enough to appreciate the deeper facts that are revealed by those teachers of the race; and from intercourse with them, we come back with new power of insight into ourselves and others. There are many phases of life and states of mind of which we should be ignorant, were we not informed of them by the highest writers of the world. There is an intensity of life in a great poet, that drives him through all varieties of human experience. He lives more in a day than many souls live in a century. We are astonished to find in his pages our most secret thoughts, even the most evanescent shades of feeling, reproduced. He also transports us out of ourselves, and, by the power of sympathy, causes us to live in the experience of others; and, for the time, behold things through their medium.

Now, this knowledge of human nature is essential to a

Digitized by Google

correct understanding of Scripture, especially of the moral side of Christianity. The words of Jesus came from the most profound depth of religious experience. Through the history of the temptation and other similar occasions, we look upon the inward struggles of that heavenly soul that was "made perfect through suffering." To comprehend the New Testament fully, we should know, not only the word spoken by the Saviour, but the precise condition of his mind when he uttered it. The latter we can understand only through a similar experience in ourselves, or by observing it in others. In proportion to the richness of this experience will be our power to appreciate the adaptation of Christianity to our wants. Who cannot recollect the time when in some peculiar state of mind, or some deep affliction, or some change in his circumstances, producing a spiritual revolution, he took up his Bible, and was overwhelmed by the force of some passage which he had read a hundred times before with indifference? We all have observed this. Our souls were then in a condition either *resembling* that of the Master's when he spake this word, or which he could understand by his miraculous insight into character. We must *live up* to the sayings of Jesus before we can comprehend them. He who studies not his own mind and the minds of others through observation and the highest literature of the world, will remain ignorant of the treasures of divine wisdom contained in the biographies of the Son of God.

The man then who knows most of human nature, other things being equal, is the best interpreter of Scripture. It is not strange that our commentaries pervert the word of God when they are often so destitute of this qualification. Philology is not the key of Scripture. One may understand the precise meaning of the words of Jesus, but if his heart be cold, and his religious experience barren, his interpretation will be fantastic and unnatural. It is out of the depths of sorrows and joys, the weariness of the will and the strength of temptations, the lessons of life and death, not merely out of grammars and lexicons, that the discipline of the true commentator upon Scripture must come. We are not insensible to the value of learning in the study of the Bible; but we have many proofs of its impotency, divested of a knowledge of humanity, to interpret the

Digitized by Google

word of life. If this is humiliating to the pride of critical theology, it only proves that the science is imperfect, and, like every other, should be refreshed by contact with the warm life of humanity.

We have now imperfectly indicated the relation existing between theology and three of the great divisions of literature. The subject is so vast that, in our despair to say things worthy of it, we have often written the first thought which came to our mind. But the most commonplace view of it must convince any thinker of the reality of the relation, and the futility of theological study divorced from pursuits so intimately connected with it.

We have spoken chiefly of the importance of literary culture, not that we rate it above theological learning, but because its claims are not so usually acknowledged. We suppose the necessity of profound biblical scholarship is not denied at this day, except by those whose deficiencies amount to a disqualification to express an opinion upon the subject. A conviction of its importance is not wanting to the most uninstructed, but rather strength of will to concentrate mental energies dissipated by habits of indiscriminate reading, and extempore thinking, writing and speaking. It may be said that an exclusive devotion to polite literature by our preachers, has been the source of our great deficiencies in theology; but we see little evidence, in any body of Christians around us, of a generous and comprehensive study of the great masters of our own and foreign languages. The perusal of all the new books of the day does not necessarily make one a literary man. The reading of Mr. Davis's great book of revelations, or popular treatises upon astronomy and geology, will not make us scientific. The absorption of every wild system of modern philosophy, or every sparkling history, made to be read with the eyes half shut, will not make us philosophers and historians. The literary character is formed by a long and painful study of the few great minds of the world; by grappling with books that frighten indolent minds; by discarding that foolish notion of "knowledge made easy" which is elevating every pert school-boy to the seat of a Plato. If literature is studied in this spirit, the interests of theology will not be neglected, the habits of investigation, and the thirst for knowledge thus formed,

Digitized by Google

will drive the student forward into the most unattractive domains of biblical criticism.

Theology, we repeat, is the highest of all pursuits; so important that all human learning is necessary to illustrate it. We degrade it when we bring to it minds uncultivated and undisciplined. It requires for its generous comprehension an intellectual power developed by reflection upon the most profound questions of philosophy; an experience enlarged by a complete view of history; a love for reality caught from a study of the facts of science; imagination and tenderness of feeling refreshed by the highest poetry. Who does not see that a man thus furnished, will impart a new vitality to the details of theological science, will not be buried in his philology and antiquities, will learn to separate the spirit of the gospel from the letter. But all experience proves the inefficiency of an exclusive study of biblical criticism. It narrows the mind, and chains it to forms and proprieties of speech. It would not be difficult, even among ourselves, to point to examples of this, although the full harvest of such a culture is best exemplified in the speculations of many of the German theologians. These men, in the pursuit of subtle meanings, miss the only rational interpretation of Scripture. They lose the proportions of revealed truth by looking upon it with microscopic eyes. Religion suffers violence at their hands, for their attempts to defend her are more destructive than the assaults of skeptics. They stand around the Bible like a party of surgeons with their dissecting knives around a corpse, and they leave it a mangled body, hewn in pieces, from which the soul has escaped!

The man of wide literary culture will not thus insult the word of God, but will learn its true value. His researches in all domains of learning, will only make him humble. He will at last feel that truth, the reception of which is the birth of greatness, — that the human soul is encompassed by mystery which it cannot penetrate. When he has ranged through the vast area of physical science, and followed its diverging paths until they all ran into darkness; when he has reflected upon the problems of philosophy, and they conduct him to a point where he can no longer reason, but only bow his head to worship; when the history of the race lies like a chaos before him,

Digitized by Google

and he is forced to confess that, without an idea of Divine Providence, it can never be filled with light and beauty; when he has surrendered his imagination and his heart to the witchery of the poet, and in his highest moments of transport heard only smothered and inarticulate voices from the eternal deeps, then only can he return, and, humbling himself like a little child, sit down at the feet of Jesus. A. D. M.

Art. XX.

The Unwritten History of Universalism.

History is a narrative of past events. Men, nations, or other actors, appear on the stage of history, and perform their parts. The historian then finds scope for the exercise of his skill, in tracing the progress of events, and pointing out the connection of causes with their several effects. Our own denomination has a history. Able writers have sought to give an account of the developement of our faith and the various phases it has assumed. Arranging this history in chronological order, we have already had books published containing both the ancient and the modern history of Universalism. I intend not in this article to go over the ground which the authors of these two works have already trod; for I presume that both of them have nearly exhausted the accessible sources of information.

My task is different. The object of this article is to mention some matters connected with a yet unwritten history of our faith; I say, unwritten, because the events which I should be glad to chronicle have not yet taken place. In a word, this history is not yet written, because we as a denomination have not yet *made* it history. I shall then be forced to speak of what *remains to be done*, and of what *ought* to be done, rather than of what has been accomplished.

Digitized by Google

I have no sympathy with that vanity which leads so many to speak of every new philanthropic developement, as a consequence of our faith. If new enterprises of a benevolent character are going on in the ranks of our opposers, it is not because we have given so shining specimens of piety, as to shame them by the splendor of our goodness, into earnest action; for if we measure our deeds by the standard which our system sets up, we are faulty enough. The reason why such benevolent movements are going on in other denominations, is because Christians are turning their attention more closely to the divine word. The light of the gospel streams through the mists of error, and throws upon the path of duty a steady radiance. The warmth of that gospel is melting stern souls into sympathy with man; and the compassion of Christ and the love of God have been better appreciated than in some former eras. Indeed whatever may be men's creeds, if they will but study God's word attentively, they must catch the inspiration of kindness. Those creeds may in some degree neutralize the influence of the Scriptures, or lessen the power of love, yet unless the advocates cease to peruse the Bible, the record of Christ's sympathy and condescension must impel them to more affection. It is from the gospel then, that the spirit of benevolence and sympathy, which animates every real reform in the present generation, comes. While I say this, however, I am fully convinced that our own faith in its essential elements is identical with Christianity. It is not probably faultless. Doubtless we err in our exposition of certain passages of Holy Writ. Very probably we attach an exaggerated importance to certain tenets, and undervalue others. A perfect system of theology is what the world does not yet realize. We cannot find it in the creed of any single sect. Still, I believe that in the leading features of our system, in the grand truths that underlay it, and give it moral vigor and a claim to the reverence of every lover of man, it is identical with that gospel which, eighteen centuries ago, was taught by the Saviour of the world. What do I mean by the leading principles and prominent features of our system? What are the grand truths underlaying our faith? I answer, the boundless love of God; the parental relation he sustains to man; the authority of Christ; the perfect benevolence of his mission; the final

Digitized by Google

triumph of God and holiness over error and sin; the full deliverance of man from ignorance and vice, and his subjection to Christ and God. As to the mode of God's accomplishing his designs, as to the means which Christ may employ for eradicating sin from the human heart, we may sometimes err. Perhaps our opinions on these and kindred points are not properly systematized. But that Jesus will reign till all our race are subdued to him; that a close will finally come to his reign; that he will surrender to God his authority, and see him the All in all, while every heart is filled with his spirit, and every soul in the universe burns with love to both God and man, — that these results will be attained, we cannot doubt so long as we hold the Scriptures as final authority. These central truths are, as I conceive, drawn from the Bible, and should exert the mightiest influence on human character.

Have these truths been sufficiently regarded? Have they had that prominence in our thoughts which their intrinsic excellence demands? If I mistake not, they must be heeded in order to introduce the state of things which is universally spoken of in the Scriptures as resulting from Christ's reign. We have seen enough already in the past history of the church, to convince us that no narrow theory can produce genuine love. The legitimate influence of every such doctrine is to foster exclusiveness or jealousy. But Christianity is a broad and expansive system. It aims at binding the world together in bonds of love. Peace on earth and good-will to men, were announced as the consequences of Christ's coming: connected with these is the ascription of the highest glory to God. But to draw such an ascription from every soul, to cement all parts together with love, which the apostle well called "the perfect bond," we require a system of the most far-reaching benevolence. Love in man proceeds from a conviction of God's love. "We love him because he first loved us"; but how a system of faith which practically denies his love for the whole of our race, can suitably impress every soul, or make us ready to exhibit the comprehensive affection that Christ demands, I confess myself unable to see. At all events, I have no faith that the mass of mankind, whether nominal Christians or otherwise, will ever exemplify in their conduct and spirit the moral excellence that the gospel

Digitized by Google

requires, till the truths which I have spoken of as the leading ones of our system are generally believed. Men may scorn the name of Universalism. Some of us even may disown it; yet the principles which underlay our doctrines must be generally embraced, ere the deep love for both God and man, that the Bible demands, is attained.

These statements seem to me as clear as demonstration itself. I know not how any honest, earnest advocate of our sentiments can assert less. If, then, such is our conviction, may I ask what we have a right to expect from Universalists? What should the history of Universalism be, but that of a doctrine winning numerous converts, and transforming them all into intelligent, philanthropic, Christian men? The gospel certainly is calculated to insure the highest refinement, the noblest civilization, and the tenderest affection. It is content with nothing short of these.

What do I mean by the highest refinement? Not that squeamishness which would complain even of Nature for vulgarity. Not that mawkishness which represses even the most distinguishing characteristics of our nature, lest some delicate sentimentalist shall find his sublimated sensibilities shocked. This is not my idea of true refinement. What I mean by it is that high moral purity which Christianity enjoins, which represses the grossness of passion, and while encouraging the deepest sympathy for our race, leads us, as we hope for heaven and immortality, to purify ourselves as God is pure. I know not that our denomination has been characterized by such true refinement. Where is the proof of it in the past, where the evidence of it in the present? While we witness the lack of true spiritual excellence, of superiority to debasing vices and grovelling practices among both our fellow Christians, and our race generally, have we no occasion to lament our own deficiency? Is the tone of our literature so lofty, the character of our conversation so pure, the strength of our fervor and the uprightness of our conduct so marked, that we seem like angels of purity, who can move amid the most polluting scenes like Christ himself, without marring the perfection of our characters? Admit that man's subjection to frailty is so great that sin almost necessarily results; acknowledge that absolute perfection is not to be hoped

Digitized by Google

for on earth; are we capable of making no closer approximation to it than we have already made? I cannot believe it. Christian excellence is not such a phantom as it is often represented to be. There is a meaning in those passages of Holy Writ which bid us go on unto perfection. And such perfection our denomination must yet seek with deeper earnestness than it has ever evinced, ere our claim to be thorough disciples of Jesus Christ is admitted.

Next, we need a nobler civilization. No better definition can be given to this term than Guizot has supplied. It consists of two elements; one, the highest developement of our internal nature; the other, the greatest improvement of our external condition. There is a wide field embraced in such a definition. What can be deemed the highest developement of our spiritual nature? Certainly the attainment of knowledge, the discipline of mind, and the acquisition of the deepest love. I use the term knowledge in reference to both secular science and religious truth. The time has been when these were considered as hostile to each other. It required no little resolution on the part of learned Christians, to preserve worldly science from the condemnation of misguided zealots. Thank God! it is now generally acknowledged that a learned man may exist without being in league with the devil. Rigorous scientific investigation has brought no reproach on scriptural truth. It may have caused commentators to vary their interpretations of particular passages of Holy Writ, but it has not caused, — it cannot cause the Scriptures to be exploded. Galileo was thrown into prison, because some of his views of astronomy were deemed hostile to the Bible; but though he professed to abjure what was considered his grand error, while the world has adopted it, mankind, instead of rejecting the Bible because they know that the earth turns on its own axis, adore the wisdom of that God who has constructed all his works on so grand a scale. The fact that the sun is the centre of our solar system, by no means militates against the truth that God reigns over the universe, and is perfect love. Every new discovery in the world reveals more conspicuously the wisdom of the Deity; every part of creation teems with proofs of his beneficence; every investigation, while sharpening the mental powers of the inquirer, or furnishing additional stimulus to

Digitized by Google

the mass of minds, raises the intellect from subordination to the senses, and fits it for clearer views of God's nature. They alone whose minds are expanded by knowledge, truly understand that God is a spirit. An intelligent race is the only one that can worship God in spirit and in truth.

But with secular knowledge religious should be connected. This indeed is needed to restrain human pride. The closest student of nature will of course possess the deepest humility. Who better than he has learned the bounds of human knowledge and the infirmity of the intellect? Locke, Bacon, and Newton, cannot be reproached with pride or pertness. In their minds we find a childlike simplicity and humility. But with others who are smatterers in learning, there is ground for the remark that "knowledge puffeth up." Christian truth is needed to remind them of the feebleness of our powers and the littleness of our knowledge. When it comes, revealing to them the fact that there are deep secrets locked in the Almighty's wisdom, which the human mind may not at present hope to fathom, the fewness of our attainments and our almost absolute ignorance become manifest. Then do we discover that the true road to knowledge is an humble, teachable frame of mind. But view the grand truths of revelation, and see how important these are to the proper cultivation of the soul. What is there in secular science so sublime as the truth that there is one God, who created and who governs the world? What hero is chronicled by history, what character has been portrayed by the imagination, to compare with Jesus Christ? What heathen oracle, what prophetic utterance even of the human soul, teaches in unambiguous tones man's immortality? To question the human intellect, and expect a satisfactory answer relative to a future life, is like asking the sullen surges of the ocean as they rock themselves to repose, how soon another storm shall break their rest. I confess that without the teachings of the New Testament, I should cherish but faint hope of another life. Christianity is the only light that throws a clear ray over the darkness of the future. Without the noble truths contained in the Bible, I fear that one element of real civilization could not exist; at least there could be no permanence to civilization. Like

Digitized by Google

the kingdoms of antiquity, which rose by courage and activity, but invariably sank by cowardice, sloth, and corruption, civilization would expire from the lack of that conservative power, which high moral principles and religious truth alone can supply. Now the acquisition of such knowledge and the systematizing of it, produce the mental discipline that is connected with high civilization. Give us scientific knowledge, give us an intimate acquaintance with religious truth, and we have secured a good degree of mental cultivation.

But is knowledge all that is required? Can that mind be considered completely unfolded which has boundless knowledge of the universe, and a thorough acquaintance with the dogmas of Christianity? Unhesitatingly do I answer, No! Well did the apostle say "though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing." The noblest attribute of God, love — what were man without that? The words of the apostle show its importance; and even if our denomination could make far higher claims to intellectual superiority than it now can; though in every point of faith our creed were faultless; yet if we fail of obtaining and exhibiting genuine affection, the crowning excellence of high civilization is wanting.

May I now ask what judgement truth would compel us to pass on our denomination? Faultless no one will be foolish enough to deem it. An approximation to the position that we can and should hold, we have hardly begun to make. Where is the evidence of our appreciation of knowledge? What pains have we taken to raise the standard of education in our ranks? Common sense would suggest that, to make the denomination gain the highest mental elevation, its teachers should be learned men. I use the word *learned* in the best sense of that epithet. I mean by it those who have obtained a knowledge not merely of secular science and general theology, but of man. Whatever sneers may be lavished upon a pedantic ministry, (and such sneers are certainly deserved,) I deem it indisputable that a thoroughly educated clergy is essential to the rapid growth and permanent prosperity of our sect. But what measures have been adopted, to

Digitized by Google

furnish us with able, eloquent, and skilful ministers of the word? Any adequate ones? Not as yet. And why? I can assign but two causes for the neglect; either the people, as a whole, are too ignorant to appreciate the value of sound and thorough instruction, or they are too poor to supply our youth with the means of obtaining the education that they require. Is the latter the fact? I believe not. Whatever was our condition in former years, we have now pecuniary ability to establish a college and sustain it, to provide academies, and promote in the highest degree the cause of education among us. If then, while having the means of elevating our denomination, we will not use them, is it not self-evident that, as a sect, we do not know our own deficiencies? Can we realize them, and yet withhold the means of supplying them? Let not these remarks arouse the indignation of any one. It were a fruitless inquiry, to ask whether in general intelligence we compare favorably or unfavorably with other denominations. I leave them to take care of themselves. My business is with Universalists; and I say without any fear of contradiction, that, as a whole, we are far from having attained that mental elevation which we can reach. We have among both our ministry and laity learned and wise men; but are we generally such? Can we point to a single congregation, whose members have become as intelligent as they can be? If not, of course something is yet needed.

How stands the case with the Christian deportment of the members of our sect? Can we make pretensions to signal excellence in either our devotion to God, or our sympathy with man? Do no vices linger among us? Are our meeting-houses well filled, on every Sabbath, with eager, attentive listeners? Are the churches connected with most of our congregations large? Is there not a lamentable disparity between the number composing our congregations, and that constituting our churches? Does every noble reform receive from all, or from the majority of Universalists, the countenance it deserves? May not the same inconsistency between *profession* and *practice* be found in us, that we complain of in others? I fear that all these questions must be answered unfavorably. Go into many places where professed Universalists reside, and no effort whatever is made to establish a religious society.

Digitized by Google

Enter other places where societies do exist, and few pains are taken to secure public worship. Till we rid ourselves of such incumbrances, or till the mass of our sect arouse to earnest activity in the service of God and in benefiting man, it were idle mockery to call ourselves a thoroughly Christian denomination.

But real civilization consists in the improvement of man's external condition also. And to secure such an improvement, it is essential that physical toil should become more general, and at the same time that oppportunity should be afforded to the laboring classes as to others, to discipline their minds, and surround themselves with the comforts which heighten in so great a degree human enjoyment. The writer whose definition of civilization I have borrowed, remarks that we always find in the history of nations, both these elements of civilization developing themselves, if the nation makes any improvement whatever. Sometimes one precedes, sometimes the other; sometimes they seem developed almost contemporaneously, and in some instances a century may elapse after one is exhibited, before the other is perfectly displayed. Developed however it will be at some time. It is the ordination of God, that all real improvement of the mind shall work a corresponding improvement in man's external condition. So, on the other hand, the elevation of man from savage indolence, his removal from isolation to society, gives a spur to his reasoning faculties, and produces an expansion of the intellect. The reason why our present civilization must decay, if it ever shall decay, is that it forgets one of the objects which it should seek. It is a self-evident proposition, with us at least, that Christianity is designed to improve man's outward condition. This is at once a means and an end; a means, because where the physical energies are either overtaxed or left untasked, the mind is incapable of the noblest effort; an end, because man's happiness depends in no slight degree upon the circumstances whereby he is surrounded. Of course that gigantic system of oppression, adultery, and murder, which exists to the eternal disgrace of our republican pretensions, is a proof that one grand principle of our faith needs yet to be reduced to practice in our own land. Nor can war, which makes so sad havoc with national and individual

Digitized by Google

happiness, be tolerated where love for man and a desire for his elevation and comfort prevail. Slavery and war are frightful sources of suffering. So long as they exist, the triumph of the leading principle of Universalism is unattained. Man cannot love his brother as himself, while he defrauds him of his earnings, denies him the right of gaining knowledge, or tears from him his children, and even his wife, to make merchandise of them, or to fill the bed of the adulterer. Nor can affection exist, or reverence for Christ, where those who claim a common origin rush to the battle-field, to perpetrate deeds of atrocity at which heaven weeps. A strange mode of testifying our affection for our neighbor, by burning his home, slaughtering his son, hurling the destructive shell into the midst of his family, to scatter the brains of both mother and babe upon the door-post, or by smiting him to the earth with the bayonet and the sword! Freedom, peace, we must have everywhere ere the design of our faith is fully answered.

There is work enough, then, for Universalism yet to do, in correcting prevalent evils, and in elevating the public character to its standard. We must labor to impress on men's minds the fact that, with increased advantages, there is a solemn obligation resting upon them for corresponding improvement. We must not content ourselves with merely inculcating a system of dogmas, but enforce the eternal principles of our religion in such a way as shall secure their practical observance. This done, the results of Universalism will be realized. These results have not yet been witnessed, in any great degree; nor can they be, till a more earnest sympathy with man, and a stronger love for God, pervade the soul.

It will be said here, of course, that Universalism is not to blame for what it could not help. No, nor is it to be commended for what it has not accomplished. But let us ask, what have we done, what are we doing to correct the evils of which I have spoken? Have we yet taken a high stand in opposition to every abuse, in favor of every real reform? Do we not content ourselves with lofty generalities, instead of making such a special application of moral truth to every form of evil as would secure its destruction? Take, for instance, the great subject of

Digitized by Google

human freedom. We utter brave words about man's rights and the intimate connection between Christianity and civil freedom; but even the slaveholder will prate, on our national birth-day, of man's "inalienable rights." When, however, we seek to embody our sentiments in the form of a protest against slavery, less than one-half of our clergymen are found ready to sign it. And there are congregations of Universalists, who will not allow a minister to express his opinions freely in respect to either the moral or social bearings of despotism. Of course I intend not to arraign such men as hypocrites, but I mention these facts as notorious ones, and as a proof that our whole influence is not yet thrown into the scale of freedom and humanity. What, too, is our position in respect to war? Are we all earnest advocates of peace? Will every society allow its pastor to bear testimony against the atrocities of war? Is there no restlessness in certain quarters when this topic is spoken of? Have we no journals that echo the sentiment, "Our country, right or wrong"? When I see such a motto paraded in religious journals, I cannot but ask, "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" I fear, however, that such a sentiment finds but too many advocates among our laity. It is not uncharitable, I believe, to affirm that, if the people did not love to hear such sentiments, the priests had not avowed them. Be this as it may, however, our stand, as a denomination, in favor of peace has not yet been taken. So with respect to the other matters spoken of. In short, it is demanded of us, that in our individual and public capacity, we shall show that our sympathy with man is deep, and that we are earnestly desirous of elevating our brethren to the station which they should occupy.

And here I may appropriately refer to another point. We see much written at the present time about *progressive Christianity.* Some who are sick of mere pretensions on the part of nominal Christians, ask that we shall desist from dogmatic controversy, and give more attention to practical improvement. They have frequently expressed themselves in unguarded terms, and exposed themselves to the suspicion of undervaluing doctrines. Some even affect to care not what tenets men hold, if they will only act like Christians. Undoubtedly Christian conduct is

Digitized by Google

the more important matter. A wrong faith accompanied by good works, is better for its possessor than the best faith if it is dead. Still, I believe that strong, sound faith is essential to the highest purity and activity. For one, I trust that I shall never undervalue the leading truths of our system. God forbid that I should cease to advocate them earnestly and to hold them prominent. But I would that they should be regarded as something more than mere speculations. I would have them carried out. For seventy years and upwards the tenets of Universalism have been preached to our denomination; is it not time for us now to leave the first principles, and go on unto perfection? Must we be for ever like babes, incapable of bearing anything but milk? Shall the prospect of salvation for all our race, of the ultimate elevation, freedom, and happiness of humanity, have no power to fire us with generous zeal? Or must we, while professing the broadest faith, act like bigots, misers, or tyrants? I know that there is a fear of doing anything which shall mar our harmony. The minister, the people, are anxious for union in our societies and denomination. But what is the union, that is purchased at the sacrifice of principle, worth? Of what value is our denomination to the world, if our object is simply to keep together like a mass of sand which the slightest breeze can separate? Such a union is the union of death. Like the corpse which has long been kept from the air, and which crumbles the moment you touch it, the union of any sect or party that is purchased at the sacrifice of conscience, is factitious, and can never be relied on when duty claims a sacrifice from man. Better that the dead body should crumble, and that its component parts should enter into some organization where there is life. Let me not be misunderstood. I ask not that the rights of any man shall be invaded. I desire not that the more ardent advocates of reform shall insist on making their opinions the test of others' orthodoxy. I would not have them repel from our ranks such as agree with us in the leading principles of our faith. At the same time I would not have the minister or the layman withhold his opinions on any subject connected with human improvement, when conscience bids him speak. Not denying to others the right of avowing and maintain-

Digitized by Google

ing their opinions, let every man who feels that our sect understands not, or fails of performing, its mission, rebuke, exhort, and reprove. — Let us not stop with dogmas, but carry our principles into practice.

I have thus, briefly and imperfectly, stated some of our deficiencies. As an honest man I cannot but lament them. I feel that the principles of our system are those which must ultimately prevail throughout the world. If we are not gross hypocrites every one of us must deem Universalism, in its leading truths and in its spirit, identical with Christianity. Of course, then, the virtues which Christ required of his earliest followers, he requires of us. If we exhibit them not, the kingdom of God will be taken from us, and given to a sect bringing forth its fruits. Christianity must triumph; that is a settled fact; and if Universalists will not hasten its triumph, other and better men will be raised up to vindicate the truth, and apply it to every day life. The time has come when its influence should be felt more widely. For almost eighteen centuries it has been perverted or neutralized by human corruptions and false theories. We profess to have returned at last to the primitive simplicity of the gospel; would that we could emulate the virtues of Christ! As, however, the gospel has lived, as it has arisen from the degradation to which men have reduced it, and vindicated its divine origin and its claims on man, it is not too much to predict that a brighter day is dawning upon it. It is no longer a question, whether it shall triumph at all, but simply, under whose banners it shall conquer? Under ours, if we are true to ourselves, to man, and to God. Under others, if we disregard the warnings of the past or the word of God. If we apply the eternal truths on which our system is based to actual life, and seek to mould the institutions of society into accordance with the gospel, we shall prosper. If not, otherwise. Men of higher conscientiousness, of stronger reverence, of deeper love, will be raised up, and, borrowing our sentiments, though scouting the name which we have disgraced, will commend by their lives, no less than by their words, the lofty principles of the gospel to man's regard.

But I will not take a desponding view of the future. Already there are indications of life in our midst. A more

Digitized by Google

earnest tone breathes through our literature; the subject of education is beginning to receive greater attention; ready as we have been to admit every body that asked for fellowship into our ministry, the people are showing that they desire a more intelligent clergy. Even the opposition raised in certain quarters to the preaching of obnoxious sentiments, may be considered as but the natural manifestation of human selfishness, which the gospel in its progress must overcome. Every year more and more of us are beginning to realize, that to keep quiet is not the perfection of Christian activity. Out of our own ranks as well as in them, the philanthrophic influence of Christianity is operating, and it cannot but act on us. No small portion of our ministers are scorning to follow in the wake of reform, but are willing to take the van. God be thanked for every such indication of progress! A few years, I trust, shall produce still greater improvements.

M. G.

Art. XXI.

Permanence of the Pastoral Relation.

We find, in the Epistles of the New Testament, that evangelists or missionary ministers, and stated pastors, are alike recommended and encouraged. Each class has its peculiar work. The former are to go forth "crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord;" sowing the seeds of the gospel wherever they can find place for them; awaking to life believers who were waiting only for the right voice to call them together for action; opening the eyes of inquirers for religious truth; gathering churches; "confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith." The latter are to enter in some good degree upon the labors of the evangelist. They are to reap where he has sowed.

Digitized by Google

Churches and bodies of believers, now formed, are to be encouraged and sustained. And their increase and prosperity can best be effected by a permanent ministry. Each church needs its pastor; one who shall know its peculiar wants, and be able to supply them; whose attention shall not be too much divided in the multiplicity of spiritual cares; but who can bestow upon his one united and confiding people that thought and labor which shall have the tendency to keep them strong, and cause pastor and people to grow up together an holy temple unto the Lord. This is the New Testament idea. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, thus recounts the gifts of the great Head of the church: "When he ascended up on high — he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints; for the work of the ministry; for the edifying of the body of Christ." The Epistles to Timothy and Titus contain corresponding directions for the ordination of Christian ministers.

A similar arrangement in reference to the Christian ministry is just as essential to the spread of the gospel in our own day, as it was in apostolic times. This, we believe, is generally conceded; and it is not to vindicate this opinion that we now write. We wish to call attention more particularly to the fact, that while the office of the evangelist has not seemed to lose its importance in the estimation of Christians, the same cannot be said respecting that of the pastor. In our own land, in the New England churches, in some other denominations, and certainly in our own, the utility of a permanent ministry does not seem to be so clearly apprehended and seriously considered as it should be. For this reason, among others, we would make it the subject of remarks at the present time.

It is well known that there is one large denomination of Christians, in England and America, who have from the beginning sustained a ministry chiefly itinerant. They have considered this one of their chief excellencies in church government. Mr. Wesley himself writes in reference to this subject, "I cannot believe it was ever the will of our Lord that any congregation should have only one teacher. I know, were I myself to preach one whole year

Digitized by Google

in one place, I should preach both myself and most of my congregation asleep. — We have found, by long and constant experience that a frequent change of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent, that another. No one whom I ever yet knew, has all the talents needful for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in a whole congregation."[1] Mr. Wesley is partly right, and partly wrong, here. Whatever might have been his own estimate of himself, those best acquainted with the character and ability of the man, will not readily agree that he could not sustain himself as a faithful minister longer than the time he has here specified. That the Methodist denomination has greatly increased in numbers, in time past, with an itinerant ministry, is not to be denied. That there are men qualified not only "for beginning," but for "continuing and perfecting the work of grace," so far as a human ministry itself can do it, "in a whole congregation," notwithstanding Mr. Wesley's doubt of it, is to us equally clear. With all the force of long usage on its side, this system of itinerancy, however, has been rigidly questioned even by the Methodists themselves. Ministers, possessing qualifications peculiarly fitting them for more permanent stations, have, under certain circumstances, retained such stations beyond the usual period assigned to the itinerant; — and a growing interest has arisen in the sect, in our own country, in favor of the congregational mode of church government, including, of course, the choice and retention of pastors according to this mode. The evils resulting from a ministry exclusively or almost wholly itinerant, and the good unquestionably derived, in many instances, from a permanent ministry, were perhaps never more distinctly appreciated than at the present time, in this very denomination.

The utility of a permanent ministry has, until within about the last twenty or thirty years, been generally unquestioned in theory and practice among the Congregationalists and Episcopalians of New England. The office of a settled pastor has been held in just reverence; and the history of those who have held it longest, in many of our New England churches, would afford some of the most instructive

[1] Whitehead's Life of Wesley, vol. ii., p. 177.

Digitized by Google

evidences of the usefulness of this uninterrupted connection of the minister with his people. If there have been, in some cases, difficulties arising in churches and societies, aggravated by the fact that the minister has been settled for life, and could not be easily removed, these instances, we believe, bear but a small proportion to those where, during the whole long life of the pastor, his intercourse with his people has been one of general harmony and peace. The past is full of these instances. The present shows us but few of them.

Within the period just named there has been a very strong tendency in the New England churches to reverse this ancient order of a permanent ministry. As population has increased, and free thought expanded; as sects have multiplied and new religious interests operated upon one another in a manner not known under the order of things in more puritanic days; as old-school and new-school, old measures and new measures have come into competition, and *revivalism* has raised up its new and strange advocates and pulpit directors; and as the love of novely has found its place, more readily than ever before, among the influences in operation for the support of the ministry; a notable change has taken place in reference to the practice of having this ministry permanent. In other days, the settlement of a minister was one of the most remarkable events which could take place in a town or parish, and the ordination-scene one to be remembered for long years or a long life; the candidate for the ministry was then most patiently and attentively tried in the various duties devolving on the pastor, before the decision of the parish and church was given in his favor; and when once solemnly inducted into the sacred office of pastor, he deemed himself henceforth one with his people, theirs in weal and woe, in life and in death. But behold, what a new aspect is presented! The ministerial settlement is no longer a remarkable event; the ordination or installation may now take place with far less of intense preparation and imposing ceremony. The candidate may have but a brief trial of his gifts before those who would employ him, if the general fancy is secured in his favor; or, he may be called and even engaged, with but very little acquaintance with a people who have delegated a com-

Digitized by Google

mittee to secure him for them by virtue of his popularity elsewhere! Then the settlement is precarious. It may be a long one; it may not. Neither minister nor people can answer for that, so far as the agreement exists. He may have a more urgent call elsewhere. They may be very willing he should have such a call. He is not bound; they are not; and each is influenced more or less by this conviction. This, in brief, is the contrast between the present and the past. That pastoral changes are sometimes necessary and beneficial, we shall not pretend to deny; nor shall we undertake to maintain the propriety of returning wholly to the old order of things in relation to the life-settlement of the pastor. The ground we would here take, is, that a permanent ministry is by all means best calculated to promote the religious interests of the Christian church and congregation. And in the further consideration of this subject, we would, in the first place, notice some of the effects of a transient ministry.

The sacredness of the relation of pastor and people becomes less and less realized, as the ministry is transient and changing. Formerly, when the minister was inducted into his office, the people regarded him as their own. They were to respect, and love, and aid him, and he was to give out his best exertions for them — his whole heart into their hearts. He was theirs; they were his. Mutual aid was expected. If he had infirmities, they were disposed to bear with them, or to aid him in overcoming them. So was he to be their helper. If he had strong virtues, they knew he would use these virtues to their advantage. They were not watching for his weaknesses that they might contrast them with the virtues of another who might be desired instead of him; nor fearing that the admiration of these virtues elsewhere would tend to sever his pastoral relation with them. We speak here, of course, in general terms. There were many instances where this intimacy and mutual confidence of soul existed. But where shall we look for the corresponding likeness in the brief ministerial connections of more recent days? Now, this conviction, that the minister after his ordination or installation, belongs to them, cannot be confidently felt by the people. He may tarry with them or he may not. If he have weaknesses, it is hardly worth while to attempt to aid him

Digitized by Google

in overcoming them. The intimacy is not close nor the interest deep enough for that. If he have virtues and rare gifts, these are rather fearful indications than otherwise. They may prove the very means by which he shall be called away from them. Others have ears to be pleased with agreeable sounds, tastes to be gratified with rare qualifications, hearts to be moved by genuine virtues. He is not their own but may be another's. This is the conviction of the people; and notwithstanding all the pleasant intercourse which pastor and people may have enjoyed under these circumstances, this conviction at the bottom of all will have its effect during every month or year of their connection. We shall never forget an incident in our own experience illustrative of this very fact. It was that of an aged and devoted mother in a society over which we had just been installed pastor, in place of another who had recently removed. "I shall always be pleased to greet you," said she, "and think I shall enjoy acquaintance with you, and shall wish you well in your Christian labors here; but I cannot again set my affections on any minister as I would be glad to do. One good pastor has just left us; you, too, will leave us bye and bye." The prophecy was true; though the intercourse of pastor and people was mutually pleasant to the end.

Again, a transient ministry deprives the society of that kind of pulpit instruction it most needs. The stranger knows not the wants of a people, as the pastor, who has the direct oversight of his charge, knows them. Though doctrinal and practical sermons, as applicable to one people as to another, may be preached to positive advantage by the evangelist in the formation of a society, a different course is to be pursued by the pastor. He may preach the same truth, but in different forms, and with special adaptations to the known and varied dispositions, characters, tastes and wants of his people. But this cannot be done by the minister who is apprehensive that his long continuance with the society is doubtful. He may begin a good work in the pulpit, but has no assurance of making much advancement therein, ere his ministerial relations are interrupted, and he suddenly finds himself beginning the same work in another pulpit, and his people are beginning the same lessons under another teacher. This is not progress in Christian knowledge.

Digitized by Google

A transient ministry, moreover, has a tendency to encourage disaffections. Let the sacredness of the pastoral relation be lightly esteemed, and the fault-finding and factious, if there be such in the society, have the readier inducement to create discords and effect divisions among its members. If, in consequence of their influence, the minister is dismissed, his successor may have as little enjoyment to hope for with a people thus liable to internal agitations. And so strife and alienation and division come. It has been remarked by an experienced pastor of New England, that "in those churches which frequently change pastors, a very large portion of their difficulties are in some way connected with the dismission of a minister." It sometimes happens, too, that the desire to hear new candidates for the ministry becomes so intense as to threaten the greatest derangement of opinion in a society; so that, at last, through fear of absolute dissolution, they are impelled to the settlement of one who in the beginning might have found but small favor with them.

And, once more; this very light estimate of the sacredness of the pastoral relation is one of the most blighting evils that can fall upon a Christian church or congregation. Let the whole matter of agreement with the minister for his services become one of business; a mere bargain, so much money for so much in time, and prayers, and sermons and social acquaintance; let the leading inquiry of the people in reference to the minister be, who will preach with the greatest apparent effect? who will render our place of worship popular? who will fill the house, and keep our pew-property at par? and you have but little else than the thinnest shell of a religious society. Its hollowness will be apparent to all who can judge of Christian pretensions and study Christian character in the light of the New Testament.

The effect of a transient ministry on our societies and congregations is not all. The minister himself is a loser thereby. His plans of operation, for the present and future good of his people, are embarrassed with uncertainty in respect to his continuance with them. If he have the soul of a good pastor, he would make full proof of his ministry. He would bring "things out of his

Digitized by Google

treasury both new and old." He would "reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine." He would enlighten the ignorant, strengthen the weak, console the mourning, confirm the doubting, lead the young in the way of righteousness, and be to the aged a sure guide to heaven. To do this he must know his people, and adapt his preaching, week after week, year after year, to their condition. But how can he enter into this work as his heart impels him, when he knows not how soon he may be called upon to dissolve his connection with this very people? Which husbandman will lay out most surely and extensively for improvements on his farm, one who is conscious that he occupies it only a tenant at will, or he who has long years before him in which to make and to enjoy these improvements? The answer is apparent.

Then, in case of frequent removals, the minister may be losing intellectually, rather than gaining. He may be scattering and often wasting, rather than concentrating and directly employing his energies. The very fact that a minister is an itinerant, has a tendency to diminish rather than increase his exertions for improvement in sermonizing. The discourse he is preaching now to one congregation may answer as well a year or two hence with another. The dependence he may thus place on his past labors will incline him to relaxation from close or severe study for the pulpit. He will find other calls for his time and attention; and though he may be useful, his influence in the pulpit cannot have the extensive range of the stated pastor. It will be found, on examination, that some of the noblest theological and religious productions the world has ever known, have come from Christian pastors who have spent a greater part of their lives with the same congregations, and who, in consequence of the incessant tax upon their minds, have been enabled thus in the variety of their investigations, to instruct and bless their fellow-men. But such inspiration cannot be supposed usually to dwell with a transient ministry.

Another effect of this frequent change in the pastoral relation, is, to lessen the feeling of genuine Christian independence in the minister. Where he would do good "in all godliness and honesty," this evil of a precarious settlement is present with him. He cannot be the true servant

Digitized by Google

of Christ so long as he feels that, in a most un-*christian* sense, he must be a servant of men; that he must not be true to his convictions of duty through fear of giving offence; that he must not speak nor act with an apostolic independence, lest he create disaffection, and speedily have intimations given him that his services are no longer needed. This is not the representation of what a true Christian minister should be, "no man-pleaser," but one "speaking the truth in love" faithfully and freely, satisfied that he will be sustained by his people, and that their estimate of the worth of their minister's service increases with the evidence of his fidelity to their best interests, to his own conscience, and to God.

In speaking thus of the evil effects of frequent ministerial changes, we have been silent on one topic which certainly claims attention; though a passing notice is all we can bestow upon it. We refer to the inconvenience (to use no more expressive term) of these frequent removals, to the family of the minister, if he has one; and this will be true of the minister in a majority of instances. In our considerations thus far, his companion in life and his children have been left out of the question. But they really deserve some notice, being constituted like other mortals, and consequently more or less affected by disappointments or satisfactions in social and domestic life. And what can this life be to them, where the earthly location of the family is so uncertain? True, if a clergyman's family are all agreed in the migratory life, that alters the question. If they are, by constitution or habit, prepared for such life, our sympathy would be as much wasted on them, as on a family of dwellers in tents traversing some eastern desert. But we refer to families whose members have an ordinary share of "inhabitativeness," and would not often change their home in society. With such a family, this frequent note of preparation for departure from one known and loved neighborhood to another of strangers, must be any thing but welcome. To say nothing of the actual drudgery often imposed on the family in the act of removing, the very consideration that it has no abiding rest among its friends, and that it must often be in readiness to adjourn the consideration of its plans for the present or future to some other community of untried acquaintances, is enough

Digitized by Google

to bring disrelish into most of its social enjoyments. This, then, is a matter of no small weight in our estimation of the evils of a transient ministry.

Such, then, are some of the unfavorable indications showing themselves in connection with frequent ministerial changes; evils of great prevalence at the present time, and which call for the faithful attention and exertion of Christians that they be removed; evils which afflict our own denomination in common with others, and in view of which we are required to exert the right influences, that order and growth, and not instability and decay, be our own blessing in the present time, and the inheritance of those who shall succeed us.

In further consideration of our subject, we would next inquire into some of the benefits of a permanent ministry. This is a fair question, and one that well accords with "the spirit of the times." We are all prone to ask now, in reference to any movement or enterprise for the temporal or moral good of mankind, is it of utility? shall we be gainers by it? will the experiment "pay"? if the work shall become permanent will it yield good interest? We may propose all these questions in reference to a permanent Christian ministry; and answers may be found in full and strong support of the claims of such a ministry on all our churches.

1. In support of these claims, we may observe that, under a permanent ministry, that acquaintance and attachment may be formed which are indispensable to the usefulness of a minister, and the welfare of his people. We all agree that no dearer attachment can be formed than that of the family at home. The pastor and his people constitute one family. Their spiritual interests are in common; they are lovers, helpers, one of another. Each has his station and duty according to gift, age, experience, means; and their relation should be permanent, so far as human wisdom and life can render it so. Can that family be rightly disciplined and blest together, where the heads of it are often changing? Will mutual attachments be daily and yearly growing stronger and deeper in all hearts, under such differences of home aspects? The questions contain their own answers. And they apply directly to Christian societies and churches. The heads

Digitized by Google

here should be permanent. The minister should feel that he may venture to fix his heart on his people; that he may love them with his whole soul, and anticipate an increase of this attachment as year after year of his ministry passes. The people, too, should esteem their minister not as one who, from some slight consideration, may be transferred to another family, but whose connection with them is such that, his life and health being spared, they may have increased confidence in his fidelity and devotion to their interests. That the Christian society may truly prosper, it is of unquestionable importance that there should be mutual affection and fidelity between them and their pastor. This affection cannot spring up in a moment; it must be the growth of experience, mature acquaintance, sympathy, trial and exertion.

2. No man can be a true pastor who is not acquainted, in some good degree, with the dispositions and habits of his people. He should know them, not as a stranger does by outward appearances only, but in actual disposition and every-day life. He should know, not only how they look or speak in church or on the Sabbath, but what they are at home, and how they conduct themselves in their ordinary secular avocations; what they really think of themselves, and what their neighbors think of them. He should know their prejudices, their virtues, their wants, as a brief acquaintance can never reveal these to any mind. And in view of all these, his social intercourse and pulpit labors will be directed. His observations will not be taken by rapid glances, but in a quiet, steady and repeated survey. It is in this way only that the pastor can rightly obey the apostolic injunction to give to every one of his spiritual flock a portion in due season.

One great object of a Christian society is growth in truth and grace. This growth can never be effected by a transient ministry; we mean such growth as the Bible requires. We do not deny that transient ministers may awaken thought, elicit investigation, preach wholesome truth to the people and scatter many good seeds of the kingdom, which shall here and there bring forth fruit to the joy of some enlightened spirit, and to the glory of God. But what we mean is, that this kind of effect is not all we want in the society that has taken upon itself the work of

Digitized by Google

nurture and growth in the truth of the gospel. Leaving "first principles, it is to go on unto perfection." Being established in the rudiments of Christian doctrine rightly explained and enforced by the misistry, it is to make increase in the spirit of this doctrine — increase of faith, hope and love. One, or two, or a dozen sets of doctrinal discourses will not answer for it; numerous statements and illustrations of controverted points of theology will not; nor repeated expositons of Scripture. All these are right in their time, in their place; and they have both. They form a part of the pastor's instruction; but not all. The society needs the sure growth of the practical element of the gospel in the hearts of its members. And it is with this end in view that the pastor is to direct his labors in the pulpit. It for this he is to speak in his walk, his example, and free and faithful intercouse with his people. That his pulpit efforts in this direction have success, he must have variety in his researches for truth, and in his presentations of it. He must not be a mere dealer in second-hand discourses. He must not move in certain beaten paths; but go out everywhere into the great field of thought and inquiry, and return with new and fresh inspiration from his discoveries and acquirements. He must study assiduously, untiringly. And he must have the right inducement to study; that arising from the fact that others are looking to be led onward by his direction. Now, we ask, will a transient ministry be likely to meet this demand of a Christian society? to fulfil these just expectations in relation to a Christian pastor? Surely not. He who must tarry here for to-day only, or but for a few years, may avail himself of the same thought and round of labor in another place to-morrow, or for the next few years to come. He will not have that inducement to adapt his instructions to the constant and permanent growth of one people. Nor will any one people associated as a Christian family, make such increase of Christian knowledge and profitable experience under a variety of teachers, each one repeating, in some good degree, the lessons of another, as from the ministrations of one who has made himself acquainted with their wants, who has in prospect his permanent connection with them, and who works in the comprehensive light of that injunc-

Digitized by Google

tion on every body of Christian believers; "Add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity: for if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." So long, then, as we hold in right estimation the true Christian growth and strength of a society received from ministerial instructions adapted to the various dispositions and wants of its members, we cannot fail to perceive the utility and blessing of a permanent ministry.

3. It is the tendency of a permanent ministry to give stability of character to the minister and people. It is desirable that the character of a minister be well established in the community where he dwells. His influence ought to be something more than what his pulpit labors, or his popularity in his own society, can give him. It is essential that he be esteemed by others as a man, an acquaintance, a neighbor, a citizen. Such influence he cannot acquire in a few days or months. It takes longer time. To have such influence, the minister must not be a sojourner merely, but should be able to say as did the Shunamite woman to Elisha, "I dwell among mine own people." Such ministers will acquire a weight of character never to be gained by those who are passing from field to field of labor, having no permanent abiding place in any community. They become, by their very stability, essential parts of the community where they dwell; and, from their long and well-tried personal character, are often justly reckoned among its lights and blessings. Thus their influence not only extends beyond the lines of their own society, but reacts with increased strength on themselves and *on the people of their charge.* Such influence is worth much, every way. Some writer has said, "A settled minister of established reputation, every one knows where to find, just as we know where to find the sun in the morning and at noon-day. From him we know what to expect; and the confidence in his established reputation amongst those who know him, gives a weight to his counsels which nothing else could give. When a congregation have grown up under a minister; when they have been

Digitized by Google

educated by him; when they have tried him and proved him; when they have labored, and wept, and rejoiced with him; when they have seen and felt his salutary influence on their own souls in every family and in every department of society, they reverence and love him as children do an affectionate father, and are prepared to follow him as their spiritual guide. But frequent changes forbid the formation of this endearing bond, and shut out a people from its benign influence."

A permanent ministry, too, will give weight of character to a society. A society habituated to change in the ministry, will often be looking for this change. To sit down with satisfaction under the preaching of any one man, is not a part of their business. Their likes and dislikes are the oftener called into action, and the love of novelty encouraged. Such becomes their reputation; and every minister who comes to them will know it; for the world knows it, and judges them accordingly. Whereas, the society accustomed to a permanent ministry, and satisfied with this, secures that weight of character just mentioned as connected with their minister. They become mature and disciplined, and consequently less liable to be turned away from their steadfastness, or blown about by innovation, new fancies, *extra* gifts, or whatever else the changes of time and men may present to them. Having laid their foundation aright in this very commencement and continued support of a stable ministry, they have gained a reputation which is to them of incalculable worth. The very judgment of the world is in their favor; and if, by the righteous providence of God, they are called to part with the pastor of their choice and love, their character itself is one of the strongest invitations which can be given to his successor. If he shall be worthy of their confidence, he has but little fear of failure. He feels that he holds sympathy with tried hearts, and that he may walk not only "uprightly," but "surely."

Wherever we consult facts in reference to a permanent ministry, we shall find them generally in favor of the ground here taken. You may look into the history of most of the religious societies in New England, and you shall find that some of the best instructions in permanent religious character and united and peaceful and happy

Digitized by Google

parishes are given us, where a faithful ministry has been enjoyed with but few or no changes in it for many years. Not a few of our city and country grave-yards bear, at this moment, inscriptions of the tomb-stones on successive pastors who lived and died there in peace; following one another as faithful shepherds of "the flock of God"; ripening for the grave and for their better heavenly inheritance as they have sought to make others practical children of the kingdom, and leaving behind them a good name, earned not by a popularity showing itself for brief seasons in many fields of ministerial operation, but by steady and even work with the one people to whose holiest interests their hearts and lives were given. These memorials are among the noblest indications of moral renown of which our own loved New England can boast.

Looking into the present state of affairs in our New England parishes, we find comparatively few facts conflicting with this statement of the past. In our own denomination, or in others, where the ministry has been most permanent, *there* have societies and churches stood on the most permanent foundation, and there do such now stand. While we might cite instances where societies have been injured by the removal of favorite ministers whom they had hoped to retain, but who were induced by "louder calls," (we will not say justly or unjustly,) to leave them; we could also prove, so far as living facts would go, the evident blessings resulting from the faithful adherence to one another of minister and people amid the almost continual changes of the pastoral relation in other parishes around them. One of these cheering indications not long since met our eye, in a letter from a faithful and tried pastor in our own denomination in a neighboring state. It is in strong contrast with the evidences of transientness so prevalent in many other directions. Some of the reasons of this attachment and permanence we read in the pastor's statement of the tastes and habits of his people:—

"I must cling to this society as one of the very best. Independent and straightforward themselves, they expect their minister to be so too; not disposed to have him preach to empty pews, they generally meet him on Sabbath morning, not expecting him

Digitized by Google

to serve out a dish that will suit exactly an hundred different tastes, but to hear him express his own honest opinion; lovers of novelty *less*, and of truth *more*, they have not as yet staked the prosperity of the cause on frequent ministerial changes; they have supplied their minister with a house, not built on 'wheels' to be moved with every change of wind, but whose foundations are laid deep in the earth; they attach sufficient importance to the *minister*, but they prefer the *minister* and the *man* together; they are strong in faith, steady and firm in purpose, and ever since I have been with them, and even now, they find their greatest strength in peace and union. Thus may it ever be."

A more simple and concise description of a good parish need not be given. And heaven knows we need that such parishes be multiplied wherever our gospel is proclaimed, and minister and people would enjoy its permanent blessing and abiding peace. Where, amidst all our modern Christian improvements, do we find any conception of the pastoral relation superior to that given of the village pastor, by Goldsmith? Though it is the representation of a poetic pen, something like an original existed from which it was drawn. And the poetry has in many instances answered to fact,—fact, which has given out its sanctifying influences all around, and which will be among the most joyous remembrances and thanksgivings of multitudes forever.

This whole subject, as we have more than once intimated, has application directly to our denomination at the present time. Facts are constantly reminding us how evanescent, among our own people, their pastoral and society connections are. The fact, for instance, that out of more than one hundred and twenty clergymen in Massachusetts, only six now retain the same stations with societies that they occupied ten years since, is a most pregnant evidence of this instability. Our religious papers are weekly chronicling the removals of ministers. Ill health, (a term in some instances susceptible of a double interpretation,) or a new call to a field just vacated by another minister, are the two principal reasons given why "all communications intended for" such clergymen should, for the brief present or for some uncertain future, take a new direction. In one view, the whole matter of the relationship of pastor and people is stripped of its serious-

Digitized by Google

ness, and exhibited in the very light of children's play! We need not expect the permanent growth of societies under this evil, any more than we can justly look for the growth of a garden when its trees are frequently uprooted and set in new places, and many of its plants receive just that kind of treatment which tends to keep them stationary rather than to give them good and healthful thrift and bring them to maturity. If we are to make that increase which the new Testament requires, and which every genuine believer prays for, our great field of operation in New England and elsewhere must present a different scene from that which we now realize. Our pastors must be something else than way-faring men, and our societies something different from yearly and quarterly experimenters in ministerial stock. Our religious journals must contain far less frequent accounts of ministerial removals and installations in connection with the same societies; and our whole sense of duty in relation to a permanent ministry radically changed. It is an agreeable consideration that there are some good signs of the commencement of such a change with us; that societies in some instances are stipulating with their ministers for three or five years rather than for a briefer period. This, it seems to us, is more in accordance with propriety and genuine Christian interest, than either the old unqualified settlement for life, or the most uncertain and transitory engagements of the present time.

We are aware of the causes which, in not a few instances, have rendered this transientness in our own denomination absolutely unavoidable; causes existing with ministers and societies. Some of the latter, with best intentions, have been unable to obtain a pastor who should be theirs exclusively, or on whose services they might depend for a large share of the time. Others have been so constituted as to live mainly by galvanic operations, and so have sought only the occasional ministrations of distinguished preachers from abroad. Others, having conflicting elements in them, have lacked grace sufficient to bear one another's burdens, and keep their minister. Others have been obliged to lose the minister of their choice for the simple yet very sufficient reason that they were really unable to give him that pecuniary

Digitized by Google

support which he and his family needed. Then we are not to overlook the fact, that our clergy have not all been duly qualified for the office of Christian minister and pastor. Some of them have lacked literary and even all mental training; others, love for the practical life of a pastor, and the right tact to render it tolerable and easy to them; others, the conviction that they must do something else in the pulpit than prove directly from reason and Scripture that Universalism is true and partialism false; others, men of the "one idea," have failed from blindness to that apostolic expediency which would become "all things to all men" that some might be saved. And so forth. Ministers and societies have both been out of the way. What need we now that they find and keep the right paths? Let us render very brief suggestive answers.

1. A deeper conviction of the utility of a permanent ministry among us. This conviction can come only of a candid and faithful survey of the evils to which we have already alluded. How long the evils will hang over us, none but Providence can tell. One thing is certain, — they will not leave us so long as we acquiesce in them. When we are convinced in heart of the reproach they fasten upon us, we may be ready to take right steps in the work of reform.

2. A ministry better qualified for the pastoral office. While we have many good evangelists — itinerants — qualified by disposition and theological training for pioneer doctrinal preachers in the gathering of the society, we have need of more who are qualified, by serious thought, study and devotion, for the duties of a pastor's life. It is remarkable that, situated as we have been in our theological controversies with other sects, we have had so many good pastors as we find in consulting the past and the present. But our wants in this respect are increasing every year. We need able, judicious, devout pastors. The call for them is an imperative one, and the denomination is abundantly able to answer it, if the right conviction shall move it to the work now so earnestly inviting our best energies, that of ministerial education. Many of our people are as sensitive as others when they are called to listen to a minister evidently deficient in his literary attain-

Digitized by Google

ments. This evil must be borne till we make some simultaneous movement to effect a remedy. Till then, it is reasonable to presume that our patience, if not our pride, will, in this respect, be occasionally put to the test.

And once more; we need to have the blessing of pulpit independence and faithfulness better understood. Pastor and people should seek right views of duty here. Though pledged to truth, they must not think of standing still. They are to make increase of their faith; they are to grow, individually and together, "in grace, and in the knowledge of the truth." They ought, therefore, to have charity for their minister, and aim to be mutual helpers, one of another, in all true progress and reform. Heaven save us from the affliction of societies who cannot sustain a minister because he preaches practical Universalism so faithfully, that he spares no wrong committed with men, from national governments, to obscurest individuals. While we would pray that ministers might always rightly discriminate in their public discourses, we would beseech our churches and societies, that they pray for helping grace to do the same when they listen to the word.

We have by no means exhausted this subject. But we can add no more now, save the prayer that a better day may soon shed its full light on our Christian societies and churches; when they shall be far more free than at present from the plague of this instability; and when our pastors, as they come to their people, shall be greeted with confidence in their Christian guidance and fidelity, and with the prospect of a long and blessed union. J. G. A.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXII.

Whittemore on the Revelation.

A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, the Divine. By Thomas Whittemore. Boston: Published by James M. Usher, 37 Cornhill, 1848. 12mo. pp. 388.

The Apocalypse is regarded, by many, as an insolvable enigma. The prevalence of this notion, among sober-minded Christians, appears to us to indicate an ignorance that reaches much farther than merely to this one portion of the sacred writings. Is it not symptomatic of an inaptitude in the public mind to understand the prophetic and poetical parts of the Scriptures, at large? of a general disqalification to appreciate their language, figures, modes of presentation, and manner of treatment? It is obvious enough, even to a superficial observer, that the Apocalypse is written in the spirit of the prophecies both of the Old Testament and of the New. Though it is indeed peculiar in its plan and in some of its forms, it manifestly employs their imagery and costume, and their symbols, through which to convey its meaning. Its machinery, if we may so speak, its use of visions, metaphors, hyperboles, in short its medium of instruction, is the same essentially as theirs. And now, if an entire book of this kind proves unintelligible to us, with our present methods of apprehending the significance of such works, it would seem that the difficulty must lie farther back than in the book itself. There must be some radical defect, or downright error, in our views of the distinguishing genius and character of the whole species of writing to which it belongs, so that we are likely to misconceive and misinterpret the former as well as the latter. This, we think, is the real state of the case. We are confident that no one who truly appreciates the spirit of Hebrew poetry and prophecy, and who can readily take in the significance of their modes of representation, will find any great difficulty in tracing out at least the general aim and purport of the Revelation of

Digitized by Google

St. John the Divine. It certainly does not stand altogether isolated, in its character, from other parts of the Bible; it is by no means a total exception among the sacred writings. Nor is it the inexplicable mystery it is commonly supposed to be. Indeed, the better class of Biblical scholars have, for a long time, understood its general meaning, and have repeatedly illustrated it; though their expositions have never circulated much among common readers, as they were adapted, for the most part, to the wants of theological students, rather than to popular use.

Another impression has had an unfavorable influence on the common estimate of the Apocalypse. Many, who have not examined it very attentively, suppose that its style is rude, its arrangement confused, and its character deformed by coarseness and extravagance, such as to render the work rather offensive to men of taste. In some degree it may be so, to those who have formed their æsthetical notions exclusively by the colder and simpler standard of western literature. But nothing is plainer than that it is unreasonable to apply this criterion rigorously, in our judgement of an eastern production. We are sure that the objection will never be felt by those of a more impartial culture, who can appreciate the richness and splendor of imagination, under all its native forms, oriental as well as occidental. Let there be no geographical boundaries, no Mason and Dixon's line, in taste. Perhaps no other work presents so magnificent an array of supernatural agencies, and of supernatural scenery all suffused with the coloring, now of solemn loveliness, and now of terror, and all instinct with life and action. By a few touches of the very boldest yet simplest kind, the whole is brought out living and moving before our eyes. It is not improbable that the wonderful strength of the drawing, has, with western readers, been disadvantageous to their understanding of the prophecy. The pictures are so strongly graphic and vivid, that we are apt to take them for the significant symbols that were purposely wrought out to foreshadow future events, when they are nothing but the drapery which the excited genius of the writer spontaneously threw around his revelations.

We are unwilling that our testimony to the poetic excellence of the book should rest on our own judgement.

Digitized by Google

Let us adduce the opinion of Herder, the best critic, perhaps, in æsthetics, that Germany has produced. No one, who has read his "Spirit of Hebrew Poetry," will doubt his competence to judge of such a point as this; nor will those, who are acquainted with his latitudinarian views of inspiration, suspect that his judgement was biassed in favor of the work, by excessive reverence of its divine authority.

"Who is there," says he, "that does not feel the *divine* of this book? Who does not even find the book peculiar in this respect? I know of more than one, who does not pretend to any intimate knowledge of its contents, and who certainly would undergo no martyrdom in defence of them, who still finds what he does understand, to be beautiful, and the whole costume and series of the imagery to be expanded and noble. Flower-wreaths from the poetry of prophecy adorn the contents of this book, as fine linen does the bride, as the heavenly cloud envelopes the angel. Should I indulge myself in the easy task of gathering parallel passages from the heathen poets, the most powerful passages of imagery, whether of Greeks or Romans, when they speak of lustrations, consecrations, mysteries, theophanies, and oracles, might be arrayed in the huge train of a victory-show. Yet I have still to say, Here is a country, a town, a sanctuary, cleansed by fire. On this spot, there shoots up, in the sacred councils of Heaven, the ark of the covenant, manna, the temple, white garments, the golden branch of the tree of life, the fourfold number, the new inheritance, the mysterious Name, the Morning Star,—all symbols of hidden and mysterious things. The consecrated have passed through a sea of trial; they bear palm-branches in their hands; within the inner sanctuary of his temple, they sing a song which others cannot learn . . . . . What selection of scraps from foreign poets could come in here, to give the book a tasteful aspect? It puts all extracts from others to shame. The true diamond borrows not its lustre from false ones. The bride, in fine linen, needs none of the purple patches of a courtesan gaudily adorned."[1]

To this, we may add the judgement of the Rationalist Eichhorn, who had a taste to appreciate poetic genius as well as critical talent, and whose immense learning extended over every department of literature:

"How can one help wondering that our poet [the writer of the

[1] Herder's Maran Atha, S. 320 ff. translated and quoted in Stuart's Commentary on the Apocalypse. Vol. i., pp. 193, 194.

Digitized by Google

Apocalypse,] stands so ill with many? Even his name excites disgust. He is accused of being one of those whose minds are in a state of hallucination, and who are not far from mania. But, surely, one who acts the part of a poet not only with so much of genius and learning, but also of art, care, caution, and sound judgement, will appear to all candid and skilful judges of the matter much more worthy of praise than of invidious and contemptuous appellations. As art has no hater except the *ignoramus*, so a poet who is so ingenious and learned and ornate, cannot have enemies and despisers, unless they be those who are far removed from all due perception of the ornate, the beautiful, the sublime, and the bold; or who, being destitute of any judgement of their own, merely follow others who have pronounced against the work from an incapacity for the finer perceptions." [2]

We hope these commendations will serve, in this country as they did in Germany, to rebuke and correct the false taste that disparages its æsthetical character, and induce those who have been prejudiced against it, on this ground, to reëxamine the work, in a more candid and liberal spirit. To appreciate it justly, we must remember that, so far as its plan is concerned, it is thoroughly an original, unless we may admit that some suggestions, in this respect, were derived from the book of Daniel. Like the scene described in the last two chapters, it was a new creation of its kind; and, even when regarded merely in its human aspects, it holds a place among the very few primitive inventions of genius, — those types that stamp themselves on all succeeding times.

It is worthy of notice, that the age in which it appeared, together with the former half of the next, or second, century, was distinguished by the rise of what may be called an Apocalyptic literature. Much of this has perished, but several of the works are yet extant, in a more or less corrupted state. The Ascension of the Prophet Isaiah, the Book of Enoch, the Fourth Book of Ezra, or 2d Esdras, the Sibylline Oracles, and the Shepherd of Hermas, may be reckoned in this class, as they consist of visions and symbolical representations, foreshadowing the supposed

[2] Eichhorn's Comment. in Apocalypsin Johannis, p. 40 seq. See Stuart, i., p. 195.

Digitized by Google

economy of the Messiah's kingdom, the state of things which should then obtain, and certain events that were expected in the future. It is probable, however, that all these were written after the Apocalypse, so that they cannot have contributed any thing towards suggesting its plan. But they show in what course the tide of Jewish and Christian imagination was running at that time, and in what forms it was manifesting itself; they also serve to exemplify certain usages which would otherwise seem peculiar in the work of St. John, and to familiarize us with his mode of representation. In this way they facilitate an understanding of the book.

Mr. Whittemore gives, in an Introduction to his Commentary, a brief sketch of the early historical testimony concerning the authorship of the Apocalypse, and the evidence furnished by the book itself on this question. There appears no sufficient ground of doubt that it is St. John's. The first fathers after the apostolic age received it unquestioned as his. The hesitancy which subsequently arose in some of the churches, may be traced back to polemical motives, so that it cannot much impair the credit due to the earliest and most competent witnesses, or the probability afforded by the general, perhaps universal, sanction of Christians up to about the year 200. The internal evidences, which Mr. Whittemore has pointed out, are strong in favor of the reputed authorship. We have long felt that what may be called the ground-work of the style is the same as in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John, — the same arrangement of words and form of sentences, and that indescribable but perceptible undertone of feeling, which runs, like a personal identity, through all the effusions of the same heart, how different soever its moods. There are also many favorite terms, phrases, and metaphors in the work, which, as Mr. Whittemore shows, are used in a way peculiar to the apostle. The only plausible objection, that we know of, to the genuineness of the book, is, the apparent incongruity of its prominent features with those of St. John's other writings. His Gospel and Epistles are distinguished throughout by a quiet, childlike simplicity; whereas the Apocalypse abounds in the most dazzling figures and gorgeous imagery. Heaven, earth, and the bottomless pit are laid under contribution for

Digitized by Google

its scenery. The question is, whether the same genius could be the author of productions so strikingly dissimilar in these respects. To us it appears that the solution of this problem depends not so much on a series of logical analyses, or even verbal coincidences, as on a readiness to appreciate human character, so as to recognize the various aspects it presents under different circumstances. We need not remind true observers that qualities, which seem at first sight the most opposite, are often found in one person. But we would earnestly commend to their consideration the inquiry, whether that affectionate, pathetic, artless, and contemplative, but still fervent spirit, which, in his extreme old age, pervaded St. John's Gospel and Epistles, does not belong to the very temperament, which, under some transporting impulse, especially in earlier life, would naturally rise to the romantic and visionary mood of the Apocalypse. That his native temper was rather ardent, may be inferred from the fact, which Mr. Whittemore quotes, that he was, in his younger days, one of the "sons of thunder," and, we will add, that he was one of those who asked leave of Christ to "call down fire from heaven" on the inhospitable Samaritans. To say the least, St. John is the one, among all the writers of the New Testament, whom we should immediately fix upon as the author of the Revelation; nor is there any thing, in this work but seems to us perfectly consonant with the same genius, say at the age of sixty, that composed his Gospel and Epistles, when almost a hundred years old, — especially, if we take into account the difference between the poetical and prophetic form, and the narrative and didactic. What can be more different, in these respects, than Christ's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of St. Matthew, and his Sermon on the Mount? Yet who feels any difficulty in recognizing both as his?

With respect to the date of the work, the only question of importance is, Was it written before the destruction of Jerusalem? or afterwards? The latter was the common belief, till within the last fifty or sixty years; but the former never wanted advocates; and, if we were to reckon only the most eminent critics since the Reformation, one half of them would, perhaps, be found on that side. At pre-

Digitized by Google

sent, it is, we think, the prevailing opinion among Biblical scholars, both in this country and in Germany. Notwithstanding the balance of early historical testimony, such as it is, in favor of the later date, placing it at about the year 96, the book itself so plainly recognizes Jerusalem and the temple as yet standing, and predicts the overthrow of the Jewish nation as then future, that we must admit the truth of these indications, or else involve the writer in some degree of imposture, — in the deceit of feigning to give us prophecy, under solemn pretence that he received it by revelation, when in fact he was only giving a piece of recent and well-known history, artfully disguised in the symbols of prophetic style. Read the eighth chapter and onwards to the end of the eleventh, comparing the whole with the repeated announcements that these things were "shortly to come to pass,"—that "the time was *at hand*," — that they were "things which must be *hereafter*," &c.; and then say, whether there is any other alternative than the one we have stated. We must also add, that the reference, in the seventeenth chapter, to seven Roman Emperors, six of whom had already come in succession, appears to fix the date in Nero's reign, or, at the latest, in Galba's, about A. D. 67 or 68. The crudeness, too, which, as critics have generally remarked, distinguishes the grammatical execution of the Apocalypse from that of St. John's other writings, and the greater prevalence of Hebraisms, seem to indicate less facility in the use of the Greek language, than he had acquired when he composed his Gospel and Epistles, — all pointing to the earlier date. In short, we believe there is nothing in the book itself, but that has the same bearing. The objection which has been made, that the degeneracy charged on some of "the seven churches of Asia," cannot be supposed to have taken place at so early a period, is obviously founded on mistake; since the same things are alleged against Christian communities by St. Paul and St. Peter, at about the same time.

The considerations, now before the reader, are well presented by Mr. Whittemore. He has introduced other arguments, however, the force of which we do not feel. The plea that there are references to the Apocalypse, in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in those of St. Peter, appears

Digitized by Google

to us a signal failure, notwithstanding it has the judgement of Sir Isaac Newton in its favor.

As an exposition of the general meaning of the book, we think his Commentary the best we have seen, for popular use. It is not encumbered by abstruse disquisitions, nor deformed by array of Greek type, or parade of learning, though the author is evidently familiar with the whole field he occupies. All is intelligible to the common reader. If there is an air of special pleading, at times, it is perhaps inseparable from the ardor of conviction. He happily avoids the great error, under which most of the former popular expounders have lain, of mistaking mere scenic drapery for the significant points in the prophecy, of regarding the work as if it were framed mechanically, not created; wrought out by measurement in a cold calculating process, scale and dividers in hand; just so many inches of canvas to so many roods and acres in future history, just so may figures and so far apart, because such was to be the number, and such the position, of the real actors in the coming scenes; all a piece of mere geometrical drawing, instead of being a free poetic creation, that rose at the vivifying influence of the word, "Let there be light." He has, at the same time, avoided the contrary and equally absurd extreme, into which some late interpreters are disposed to run, of making the whole but a vague rhapsody on the triumph of Christianity, without point or specification,—a mass of changing, unsubstantial shadows only, as if there were no revelation of definite facts in the case. Perhaps the way in which this Commentary differs the most from others of the better sort, in its general treating of the subject, is, by showing that the strong images and expressions, significant of punishment and suffering, were suggested by the usage of the ancient prophets and of Christ himself, and that they had no reference to actual scenes in the invisible world. One of the greatest excellences of the exposition is, that it brings together, on every proper occasion, the passages from all the Bible, which exemplify the Hebrew style in these respects. We do not suppose that St. John *quoted* them, or purposely and consciously alluded to them; but they show what was the kind of language and figures to which he must have been accustomed, and which he would naturally employ. We

Digitized by Google

have been surprized at the extent to which Mr. Whittemore has illustrated almost every thing in his text, by facts or expressions found in other parts of the Scriptures.

His interpretation of particular texts and phrases may not always be satisfactory, — whose will? but we suppose that the view he takes of the general meaning of the Apocalypse will, for the most part, be approved by the main body of Biblical scholars at the present day. The following tables, of division and synopsis, will lay the whole before the reader at once:

"The Apocalypse is principally divided into *four parts.* We are confident this was not understood by those who divided the New Testament into chapters and verses. It will not, therefore, be in our power to pay a strict reference to that division.

"*First Part.* This comprises the first three chapters, and contains the introduction, and the epistles to the seven churches in Asia.

"*Second Part.* This comprises the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters. It is capable of a very important subdivision, as we shall show hereafter. The great topic of this general division is the overthrow of the Jewish nation, temple and worship, and the establishment of the kingdom of God in the place of the Mosaic ritual.

"*Third Part.* This part extends from the beginning of chapter xii. to xx. 10. The principal subject throughout is the overthrow of the Roman persecuting power.

"*Fourth Part.* The fourth and last part extends from chapter xx. 11, to the end of the book. It is to be regretted that the division of chapters had not been made at the end of the 10th verse of the 20th chapter. If the 21st chapter had commenced at the beginning of the 11th verse of the 20th, the division would have corresponded much more nearly to the true plan of the work than it now does. The subject is the final triumph of the Gospel. The principal visions of the Apocalypse will be found in the 2d, 3d, and 4th parts.

* * * * * * *

"A MORE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCOUNT OF THE DIVISIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

PART I.

CHAPTERS I. — III.

Preface, or Inscription, ...	chap. i. 1—3
Salutation and Introduction, ...	" " 4—20

Digitized by Google

Epistles to the Seven Churches. CHAPTERS II. AND III.

Epistle to the Church at Ephesus, ...	chap. ii.	1—7
Epistle to the Church at Smyrna, ...	" "	8—11
Epistle to the Church at Pergamos, ...	" "	12—17
Epistle to the Church at Thyatira, ...	" "	18—29
Epistle to the Church at Sardis, ...	chap. iii.	1—6
Epistle to the Church at Philadelphia, . . .	" "	7—13
Epistle to the Church at Laodicea, ...	" "	14—22

PART II.

CHAPTERS IV. — XI.

Description of the imaginary dwelling-place of God, and of his attendants and their employments, chap. iv.

Opening of the book sealed with seven seals, which revealed the punishment and destruction of the Jews, chap. v.

Events preliminary to the Destruction of Jerusalem.

Opening of the	1st seal	— Preaching of the Gospel,	vi.	1, 2.
" "	2d "	War, ...	"	3, 4.
" "	3d "	Famine, ...	"	5, 6.
" "	4th "	Pestilence, ...	"	7, 8.
" "	5th "	Blood of the martyrs not yet avenged, . . .	"	9—11
" "	6th "	Symbols of the destruction of the Jews, and the sealing of the one hundred and forty-four thousand, ...	"	12—vii. 17
" "	7th "	The sounding of the seven trumpets, . .	viii.	1—xi. 19

Recapitulation of the events under the Seventh Seal.

The description of the events under the *seventh* seal, as we have indicated, extends through the entire 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters; and we find under this seal another series of *seven*, viz., the sounding of the seven trumpets, as follows:

Trumpets given to the seven angels, . . . viii. 1—6

Sounding of the Trumpets.

1st trumpet	— Partial calamities of the Jews, .		"	7
2d "	The same, ...		"	8, 9
3d "	The same, ...		"	10, 11
4th "	The same, ...		"	12, 13

Digitized by Google

Woe Trumpets.

5th trumpet —	Approach of the Roman armies, .	ix. 1—12
6th "	Increase of the armies, and end of the Jewish state declared, . .	" 13—xi. 14
7th "	Establishment of the Kingdom of Christ, ...	xi. 15—19

PART III.

CHAPTERS XII. — XX. 10.

Woman clothed with the sun, whom the dragon persecuted, ...	xii. entire.
The first beast, ...	xiii. 1—10
The second beast, ...	" 11—18
Symbols of the Christian Victory, ...	xiv. entire.

Seven Vials of Wrath.

The vial angels appear, ...	xv. 1
At this the Church praises God, ...	" 2—4
Vials given to the angels, ...	" 5—8
1st vial poured out, ...	xvi. 1, 2
2d " " "	" 3
3d " " "	" 4—7
4th " " "	" 8, 9
5th " " "	" 10, 11
6th " " "	" 12—16
7th " " "	" 17—21
Explanation of the judgement of the great harlot,	xvii. entire.
Fall of the city of Rome, ...	xviii. entire.
Joy of the saints, ...	xix. 1—11
Final victory, ...	" 12—xx. 10

Thus the third part ends in the middle of the twentieth chapter.

PART IV.

CHAPTER XX. 11, TO THE END OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Final Prevalence of the Gospel, and Blessedness of Believers.

The meditorial throne established, ...	xx. 11
Christ's judgment of the nations, ...	" 12, 13
Death and Hell destroyed, ...	" 14
Enemies also destroyed, ...	" 15
Descent of the New Jerusalem, and all things made new, ...	xxi. 1—7

Digitized by Google

Punishment of unbelievers contrasted with the felicity of believers, ... xxi. 8
The new Jerusalem largely described, . . . " 9—xxii. 5

Epilogue.

Angel of the Apocalypse (mentioned i. 1) assures John, at the close, of the truth of what he had shown him, ... xxii. 6, 7
John falls to worship the angel, ... " 8
This the angel forbids, ... " 9
He repeats that the time of the fulfilment is at hand, ... " 10, 11
Jesus confirms the whole, especially the fact that he will come quickly, ... " 12, 20
Benediction, ... " 21"

[pp. 67—71.

Having finished his Epistles to the seven churches of Asia, St. John proceeds, in the fourth and fifth chapters, to prepare the scene from which he shall exhibit the coming events. In vision, he enters heaven, and beholds its arrangements, its awful Sovereign, and its hierarchies, and sees the Lamb of God take from him who sitteth on the throne, the volume of destiny, which no other creature could unseal. In the sixth chapter, several of its seals are successively broken, and, at each unrolling of the scroll, representations are given of war and distress on earth, which end in a general overturn like that of an earthquake. But the faithful among the Jewish race (ch. vii.) are preserved from the common desolation. With the eighth chapter, comes the opening of the seventh or last seal, when another crowded series of representations follows to the close of the eleventh chapter, ending with the destruction of Jerusalem and of the hostile Jewish people, and the establishment of "the kingdom of God with power." Thus finishes the second part of the book. From the beginning of the twelfth chapter to the tenth verse of the twentieth, the other persecuting power, namely Heathen Rome, is shadowed forth in a similar manner, though by different images, and its complete overthrow prefigured. And the remainder, or last part, of the book, is occupied with a view of the reign of Christianity on earth.

The only part of this general exposition with which we

Digitized by Google

feel any difficulty, is that relating to the twentieth chapter. There, St. John seems to contemplate a very long period, called a thousand years, during which the persecuting power should be efficiently restrained; but after which it should break out again, when a terrible and entire destruction should be immediately inflicted upon it. To find this representation verified, in any satisfactory way, within the first centuries of the Christian era, is to us impossible. Do not the very terms of the prediction show that the apostle here looked forward to distant times? But as we have no definite exposition of our own to offer, we can do no more than to mark the passage for further inquiry.

It is natural to ask, How has the Apocalypse been understood, in the different ages of the church, from the apostolic times to the present? The history of its various interpretations may be given in five successive periods; 1. to the end of the second century; 2. thence to the close of the eighth; 3. during the Middle Ages, and onwards to the Reformation; 4. from this event to about A. D. 1650; and 5. to the present time.

1. We suppose the meaning of this book, as well as that of the rest of the New Testament, was understood by many of its earliest readers, contemporary with St. John. But it was not long before the absurd modes of interpretation, which arose in the church, wrapped the whole alike in a veil of fantastic clouds, that distorted every thing. The first distinct notices that we find of the work, show how soon its true significance was lost. Justin Martyr, A. D. 160, appears, from a very brief allusion, to have received its imagery of a thousand years' reign of the saints with Christ upon earth, as literal description; and so did Irenæus, about A. D. 180. With the latter, the beast, or the eighth king (Rev. xvii. 11,) was Antichrist, who was to come in the 6000th year of the world, (denoted by the thrice-repeated six in the number 666, Rev. xiii.) and who was to reign for a time, and times, and the dividing of time, or just three years and a half, called also 1260 days. Irenæus supposed the 6000th year to be near at hand. The number of the beast, 666, he also thought, denoted some particular name, perhaps *Evanthus*, *Lateinus*, *Teitan*, &c., though it could not then be fixed with certainty, since John had purposely concealed it. All believers would

Digitized by Google

rise in the first resurrection, and reign personally with Christ, amid all kinds of worldly affluence, in Jerusalem rebuilt and gloriously adorned. At the close of the Millennium, the general resurrection and judgement would take place, and the New Jerusalem appear,—all as literally described in the latter part of the book. Tertullian, about A. D. 200, understood it, generally, in the same way; though he held the heretic Marcion to be Antichrist.

2. With the rise of the Alexandrian School of divines, was introduced another mode of interpreting the Apocalypse, as well as of explaining the Scriptures in general. The doctrine of a Millennium of worldly pleasures was discarded by Origen and his followers, and, in the few notices they take of the book, they give every thing a moral or allegorical meaning. Others, however, explained it in a very capricious way, by a mixture of the Alexandrian methods with those of the Millennarians; and some, by chance rather than by any rational view, discovered the allusions to the downfall of heathen Rome. When Christianity under Constantine gained the ascendency, the interest for the Apocalypse visibly declined, and few wrote upon it. The laborious interpreter Jerome, about A. D. 400, only altered some former expositions, in a most whimsical manner; but the celebrated Augustine, A. D. 420, has left us a few casual explanations of his own. With him, *the beast* signified the avowed enemies of Christianity; his *image*, its hypocritical professors; the *devil was bound* when the gospel was first preached; the *first resurrection* was not that of the body, but the blessedness into which the righteous enter at death; the last of the book, however, is a representation of the end of the world, and of the scenes which are to follow. It is not till towards the year 500, that we meet with a complete Commentary on the Apocalypse,—that of Andreas, bishop of Cappadocia. His work is a medley of expositions, literal and allegorical, original and borrowed. The temple (Rev. xi. 1.) is the temple of the Christian church; the great city (Rev. xvi. 19.) which was divided into three parts, is Jerusalem with its three races of inhabitants, Jews, Samaritans and Christians. The woman clothed in scarlet is heathen Rome; the seven kings are seven Cæsars; the seven heads and the seven hills are the seven monarchies of the world,—

Digitized by Google

of which the sixth was the Roman under which John wrote, the seventh began with Constantine, and the eighth would be that of Antichrist. The thousand years' reign was the perfect knowledge of God, a thousand being the symbol of perfection; it was also the universal diffusion of the truth, which would take place a thousand years after Christ's birth. This is a specimen of the capricious manner in which the book was treated for the remainder of the period.

3. No improvement in the interpretation of the Apocalypse can, of course, be looked for in the Middle Ages. Only two things are worth noticing here: 1. In the West, it was commonly thought that the first resurrection was the establishment of the church under Christ and the apostles, and that the thousand years' reign, taken either precisely, or for a long but indefinite period, was to be measured from the Christian era. Accordingly, when the year 1000 drew nigh, there was a universal dismay, in expectation of the end of the world. The fatal crisis passed by, as it has done on some other occasions; and then it was inferred that the period was to be understood indefinitely. 2. It was about A. D. 1200, that the conceit first arose, which has had so great an influence ever since, that the Apocalypse was a prophetic epitome of the whole history of the Christian church, from its beginning to the end of all things. Various schemes for harmonizing the prophecy with the events were immediately devised, according to the prejudices of the respective authors. With the staunch Romanists, the Saracens were Antichrist; Mohammed was Antichrist, and his power was to endure just "666" years; the Imperial power of the West, also, when it interfered with the Papacy, was Antichrist; the heretics, too, were Antichrist. On the contrary, some of the Catholics themselves, who inveighed against the corruptions of the Court of Rome, found that the Papal tyranny was Antichrist, which would be overthrown at the end of the "1260 days" or years, and that the Romish Church was the scarlet woman. Afterwards, the partizans of the Imperial power, and the heretics, under the names of Cathari, Apostolici, Waldenses, Wickliffites, Hussites, &c., joined in the charge, which continued to be bandied to and fro, till the era of the Reformation.

Digitized by Google

4. Luther at first doubted the canonical authority of the Apocalypse, and made no use of it, but afterwards he adopted the anti-papal exposition, in his zeal against Rome. Calvin did not attempt to interpret it, though, if our recollection be true, he sometimes indulged himself in applying its descriptions of Antichrist, the beast, the woman clothed in scarlet, &c., to the Catholic church. Something was done by the early Reformers towards the philological and grammatical criticism of the book, but nothing of consequence towards its elucidation. It was commonly regarded by them as an epitome of universal history, from St. John's time onwards, involved in prophetic symbols. In England, the learned Joseph Mede published his Key to the Apocalypse, A. D. 1627, which for a long time served his countrymen as a classic work, in their attempts to divine the fortunes of the "Papal beast," in the prophecy. It is remarkable, that a Catholic Commentator appears to have been the first to give any thing like the true exposition of the book. A Spanish Jesuit, Ludovicus ab Alcassar, published his views, in 1614, showing that the second part, as we have called it, embracing chapters iv.—xi. refers to the Jewish enemies of Christianity; the third part, as far as the end of chapter xix., to heathen Rome; and the last part, or chapters xx.—xxii., to the final conquests, and ultimate glorification, of the church. Though the Catholics generally approved of his views, they did not always adhere to them,—the temptation was too great to retort on the Protestants the appellation of Antichrist, the locusts from the bottomless pit, &c., and to verify the charge by the requisite coincidences.

5. It will be impossible to sketch out, in a narrow compass, the several courses which the interpretation of the Apocalypse has taken, since A. D. 1650. We shall, therefore, notice only two kinds of exposition. 1. In England and America, the hypothesis that the book contains a history of the church to the end of time, has been the popular one till very recently; and it was so in Germany till about a century ago. Protestants everywhere were persuaded that Mohammed, the Turks, the Pope, the Catholics, &c., were all shadowed forth in the prophecy. Perhaps, a more flagrant instance of general infatuation could not be found, sanctioned though it has been by many learned

Digitized by Google

men, and by some who were the giants of their age in other branches of science. The names of Vitringa, Bishop Newton, and even of Sir Isaac Newton, will readily occur. When the French Revolution convulsed Europe, and when Napoleon shook down the old thrones, there were grave divines who wrote tedious volumes to prove that the whole was recognized in the Apocalyptic symbols, and in those of Daniel. Among us, this hypothesis may be said to have exploded in the person of Elder Miller; whose conceits, however, and measurements of time, were no more ridiculous, in themselves, than those of his honored predecessors. 2. But the profounder class of expositors have always kept aloof from these fancies, and many of them have traced out the meaning of a greater or less part of the book by a sober, natural use of its imagery and emblems. As long ago as 1653, Dr. Hammond explained it of the overthrow, first, of the Jewish, and then of the heathen or ancient Roman power; though in the latter part of ch. xx. he found the general resurrection and judgement, and in the thousand years' reign, and in chapters xxi. and xxii., the state of the church during the 1000 years after Constantine. In 1751, Wetstein, the distinguished German critic and commentator, confined the whole book to the period ending with the second Jewish war under Adrian, about A. D. 137. The celebrated Herder, in 1779, referred nearly all of it to the destruction of the Jews, and the consequent triumph of Christianity. In 1791, Eichhorn published his Commentary on the Apocalypse; and its appearance may be regarded as marking a new era in the history of our subject. With some fanciful notions, which have deservedly fallen into discredit, respecting a supposed dramatic form of the work, he gave so clear an exposition of its reference to the destruction of the Jewish power, in the first eleven chapters, and then of heathen Rome, to the tenth verse of the twentieth chapter, that the general meaning, thus far, may be said to have been settled. He indeed finds the general resurrection and judgement in the end of chapter xx., and the eternal state of blessedness, in the two subsequent chapters, — in which respect, Hug and others disagree with him, applying the whole to the condition of the church on earth. But as to the general meaning of the

Digitized by Google

book, there has been, since his time, a unanimity among Biblical scholars, to a far greater extent that is commonly supposed.

We close this hasty outline by refering the reader, who wishes for more particular information on the subject, to the historical sketch of interpretations in the first volume of Professor Stuart's excellent work on the Apocalypse. The reader of German may find the much fuller account, from which the Professor, for the most part, drew, in Dr. Lücke's *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis.* H. B. 2d.

Art. XXIII.

Slavery in the United States.

It is said that slavery is too exciting a topic to be introduced with safety. We think, however, that this depends, in some degree, on the manner in which it shall be treated. If we declaim upon it in a heated, passionate temper, — if, instead of speaking coolly, we suffer ourselves to be wrought up into a tempest of invective either against the evil, or against its opposers, it will indeed be an exciting topic. So, too, would any other subject, of much interest, if handled in this way. But what there is in the simple question of slavery, that must necessarily irritate, and throw people's minds from their balance, — we mean reasonable people's minds, — it is difficult to conceive. If any are disposed to foster the prejudice which has excluded the subject from free discussion, — if they are tempted to work on the common fear of its tending to irritate, in order to shut it out still, we beg them to consider whether the day has not passed by for such a policy. Do not the movements of the time show, beyond all doubt, that the discussion has begun, which will go on till it

Digitized by Google

becomes universal? To think of holding the public to silence on it, at this late period, is infatuation. When so grave and momentous a subject has fairly got hold of the public conscience, we may as well think of stifling an earthquake in mid throe. It will go on its course, through mountain and valley, and our clamor can only add a little to the confusion. The question of slavery will find its way into all places and occasions, wherever the human conscience goes. Be we for or against the institution, it is prudent to make up our minds to have it discussed, because it is now too late to prevent it, even if we would.

In what we have to say, we should like to avoid its bearings on party-politics, so called. We are so ignorant, however, as to what are all the questions claimed as such, that it is not improbable we shall here and there run across a point of this kind, unawares; and we confess, that when the moral principles of the subject carry us across, we shall follow them without much scruple. It is not right that politicians should have the monopoly of whatsoever moral question they see fit to mark for their own, and, by involving it in some party-measure, render it sacred from all independent examination.

We wish to speak of the evils of slavery, to show the relation in which we stand to it, and to consider what we ought to do respecting it. Without observing much order in our remarks, we shall aim to make them concentrate on this last point, our duty in the premises.

That slavery is an immense evil, is, we believe, universally acknowledged at the North, and perhaps throughout the free states, East and West. It is commonly said to be a very unfortunate thing for our country at large, a palsying disease in the states themselves where it exists, and a great wrong to the poor creatures who are held in bondage. We all profess a desire that it were done away; or, if this cannot be, that its alarming progress were stopped, so that it shall extend no farther. Many, of sober minds, and of far-reaching insight into the laws that determine a people's destiny, foresee our national ruin, in the growth of slavery. Those were terrible words of old President Jefferson, referring to this subject: "I tremble for my country, when I think that God is just!" For ourselves, we have no doubt that God is just, and that we have reason to tremble.

Digitized by Google

But there has been an almost universal impression that we, of the free states, have nothing to do in the case, and that, whether the evil be great or small, we are neither chargeable with it, nor so circumstanced as to act in the matter to any avail. 'We have no slavery here,' it is said; 'it is off at the South, and we cannot interfere with it there, because the Constitution of our Union forbids.' Very true, so far as the internal regulations of the slave-states themselves are concerned. 'Why then,' it is asked, 'do you trouble us with it? Go to the South, and argue it there where the evil is, and where the people uphold it. They are the ones to blame, not we.' Now, if this were a fair statement of the fact, we grant that we should indeed be both guiltless and powerless in the case, and that we might properly let the whole matter rest in silence among ourselves, if we could. But the statement is not a fair one, for it leaves out, with an instinctive wiliness, the very facts for which we happen to be responsible. The truth is, we at the North have been helping on the cause of slavery, at a stupendous rate, for more than forty years, without being generally aware of it. We find, that, since the year 1800, slavery in our country has been spread, somehow and by somebody, over nearly three times its original extent. By whose action? It did not spread without leave given, nor without some legislation deliberately carried through to that effect. And who did this terrible wrong? Partly, we of the free states, by consenting to its enormous increase, and by directly voting it through our representatives, whom we sometimes appointed expressly for that purpose, or afterwards approved for doing so, and at times cashiered for hesitating to commit the crime. It is as much our own act as it is any body's. We of the free states always turned the scale, when the question came up, for we were, all along, the majority; and had we not decided to extend slavery, it never could have been extended, but would, to this day, have remained back where the Constitution left it, or rather would have died out of itself. We do not mean but that it was the people of the South who always took the lead in the enterprise,—it was natural that they should, and there is some extenuation for them in the strong tendency of all institutions, good or bad, to propagate themselves. But what so deeply

Digitized by Google

concerns us to mark, is, that we of the North always gave aid enough to carry the measure through. Never has the attempt been made, but that we came in gratuitously, and consummated it. It is a sad confession, that there has not been even one instance, in which we have not had a hand in the multiplication of the evil, and, what is worse, that it was always our hand which turned the scale and decided for the wrong. When we cast our eye over the map of our country, and mark out the space occupied by the old slave-states, and then sweep our finger around the immense tracts that have since been added, one by one, to the area of bondage, the echo of our conscience, whether for condemnation or self-complacency, will ever be, This is our work. Nearly two thirds of all that dark territory has been covered with slavery by the people of the North, as well as by those of the South. We confess that we sometimes grow impatient, when we hear all the blame laid on the South, in order to shift it off from ourselves, so as to reserve the privilege of partaking in the wrong with impunity, as often as party purposes may seem to demand. Can so bare-faced an absurdity deceive any people in the sound use of their senses? Are we not aware whence comes that soreness, which flinches spasmodically at the very introduction of this subject among us, and which would lay a bar on its discussion, lest some favorite measure be interfered with, which the people mean to carry out by sacrificing the cause of freedom anew, if need be? It is not difficult to foresee that even this feeble attempt of ours to touch the public conscience in relation to the matter, will give less offence at the South, than at the North; because, *there* the people deal more ingenuously with themselves in the case, and understand, and openly avow, their purposes, while *here* they are playing at a game of self-deception, determined not to commit themselves against the wrong, but still hoping to keep clear of the responsibility. Nothing, however, is plainer than that they are not clear, and that they have long been the efficient patrons of what they affect to condemn.

Again: there is the territory immediately around our national capital. We of the free states own the District of Columbia, as much as the South does. We have as great a share in making its laws; we have had even a greater

Digitized by Google

share, for we have been the majority, with power to form such regulations there as we pleased. We are answerable for the institutions there, for they are of our own fashioning. And the slavery maintained there is our work, as well as that of the South. We helped to institute it; we have always upheld it by our legislation. Whether we ought to banish it at once, from the District of Columbia, is another question, that we may decide either way; but how the people of the free states can soberly think that they have nothing to do with slavery, while they support it, and havé continued for forty years to sustain it, in their own national territory,—this is more than we understand. The most of them may indeed say, that, as individuals, they do not buy and keep slaves; but they authorize and protect the practice in others. We know it is thought, by many, that to abolish slavery in our District of Columbia, would occasion an immediate quarrel with our Southern fellow-citizens. Perhaps it might. Say, if we choose, that, on this account, we ought not, at present, to abolish it there; but can we not see that this does by no means alter the fact that we are participators in it, for some reasons, good or bad? and that we speak what is false, if we say that the free states are not steady patrons of the institution? Take them alone, leaving the South out of the jury-box; put it to vote among them only, whether they will remove it from the seat of our general government, or whether they will even suppress the traffic there; and if the decision were to be made to-morrow, it would be No, — there are so many "loaves and fishes" of office, and so many party-objects, that can be gained only by compromise, — or rather by submission, for it is all on one side. We are told that our District of Columbia is the most loathsome slave-market in Christendom; and we have reason to believe the report. We must remember that *that* is our own slave-market, which we have kept open for years, and which we still keep open, without having ever made a single attempt to close it. The free states could have shut it up, at any time before the admission of Texas; and it is possible that, by a unanimous effort, they could do it now. Nobody doubts their constitutional right to stop the traffic at least, whether it extends to the abolition of slavery itself, there, or not. But they choose to let it go

Digitized by Google

on, and at the same time solace themselves with saying, that they have no connection with the matter, and that all the blame lies on the South!

The slave-trade between Africa and our country, has been prohibited, though it is still carried on unlawfully, as it always will be, while there is a market at the South. We have done, however, all that we could directly do, in this respect. But there is the slave-trade that is now maintained, under the constitutional jurisdiction of Congress, between our several states; a source of untold and incalculable misery to the wretched blacks. Whole caravans of them are driven yearly from Virginia through Kentucky into Louisiana, and now onwards into Texas; tearing the poor creatures from all their family connections, their old homes and acqaintances, and transporting them to other regions, whence they never return. If we would know the despair and unutterable anguish caused by this practice, we have only to make the case our own. Suppose a company of drovers came, about once a year, into the city or town where we live, and took our wives and children, and marched them off in separate gangs, some to Missouri, one daughter to Tennessee, a son to Alabama, and the rest to Texas; and we have but a fair instance of what is ordinarily transacting in the plantations on the Atlantic border, where it is a regular business to raise human stock for this traffic. Well may we "tremble for our country, when we think that God is just." If any are disposed to scorn the thought of bringing the wrongs of blacks into comparison with those of white men, we can only enter our solemn appeal from human vanity and heartlessness, to the righteous decision of Him who "made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth," and whose ear is not deaf to the wail of the oppressed, nor to the laugh of the scorner. Who must bear the blame of this traffic? First, indeed, the immediate actors in it, who are goaded on by self-interest and blinded by inveterate usage; and secondly, with no such excuse, the free states, who have the constitutional right to stop it, and who will not; who never made an effort to do it, even when they had the power, but have invariably joined in facilitating it whenever additional facilities were asked for; who have aided in the acqui-

Digitized by Google

sition of new territory, knowing beforehand that it was for this purpose; and who afterwards, by their hard-contested votes, deliberately and wilfully opened the immense regions for a slave-market. We beg pardon for any warmth that may escape us; but when we remember some transactions of this kind, it is difficult to suppress all feeling.

Were we now to review the main course of Congressional history, in which the free states have given, as it were, the casting vote, we should find ourselves involved in the promotion of slavery to a degree that the community at large has not the remotest suspicion of. But it is unnecessary to enter into such an examination. We may let the matter rest on the three points that have been mentioned. We have helped to swell the evil to nearly three times its original extent, as we shall soon be called upon to extend it still further. We are now maintaining it in the District of Columbia, and keeping open its market there. We countenance the slave-trade, with all its cruelties, between the several states. What we need, is, a thorough reform in all these respects, and that immediately. In a few months, will come the contest which is to decide the policy of our general government in this matter, for the next four years; apparently the most momentous crisis that we have ever passed through, since it will probably determine our future destiny, beyond retrieve, either as a free nation, or as a great and rapidly increasing slave-empire. As the contest approaches, hundreds of thousands in the free states, belonging to both of the chief political parties, will readily fall into the key-note, which both alike have already given out in deference to slavery, and will jeopardize the dearest interests and the most sacred rights of humanity, without providing a shadow of security for them. Some will do it with a smile of indifference or derision; others, with a sigh at their own recreancy, but with a hope that divine providence will somehow neutralize their folly into harmlessness, and save their souls from the guilt of their own act. We can only say, that such is not the way in which God usually recompenses rational creatures according to their works. Let us but deal honestly with ourselves, and we shall find our position, in this crisis, perfectly simple and unmistakeable. We shall

Digitized by Google

see that every step which we yield to the graspings of slave-holding interests, must contribute to build up the institution, whether that is our intention or not. Pass it off under what color we may, we strengthen the hands of the master; we increase the burden of the bondmen; we are doing all we can to perpetuate the captivity of the millions who shall descend from them, or at least to prolong it till such time as the two contrary forces of slavery and freedom tear our union asunder, in spite of all desire to maintain it, and the judgement of God take effect in our ruin. Not mere interest, however strong, not even our wishes, can hold us together, if the elements we cherish in the body politic draw us apart. There is a fundamental law in this matter, as well as in all others, that will steadily work out its results, after its own tendencies. It is the last degree of infatuation to suppose that slavery and freedom can long be made to coalesce, as equal and harmonious agencies. Let it once be ascertained that both of them are to be permanent, and from that day our eventual separation is past all preventives. We may try still to compromise; we may divide the spoils with impartial hand; we may link ourselves together by rail-roads, by commerce, by mutual profits, by great national enterprises. But under all these, the two dominant principles will go on their way, warring with each other, till neither a just heaven, nor sordid earth itself, can bear the conflict longer. Our only salvation now lies, in keeping slavery back in the limits where the constitution placed it, and where, if confined, it would at length die out of itself, as was originally contemplated. H. B. S.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXIV.

Art, and its Relations.

By the term Art, when employed in the sense in which we are about to use it, is commonly understood the whole extent of Sculpture, Painting, Music, and Architecture. In the following essay, however, we shall confine ourselves almost wholly to the relations of Sculpture and Painting, as being most adapted to the range which we wish to take. Still, what we shall say with regard to Painting and Sculpture, must in some measure bear upon the kindred pursuits; so closely connected is the whole family of Art.

Before proceeding to our direct argument, we desire to speak of certain prejudices affecting the estimation of works of Art. These productions, in the belief of the generality, are really and essentially luxuries. Moreover, there is probably an under-current existing in the minds of many, to the effect that Art through its works tends to enervate the real force, moral and intellectual, of the community. At all events, there is a prevalent sentiment (whether acknowledged or not) that Art in the grand march of human improvement bears but a very subordinate part; that it can add little to the real strength, activity, enlightenment or efficiency of moral and intellectual powers. This feeling doubtless exists to a great extent even among educated men (as they are called,) although those of them, against whom this accusation would hold good, might not always be willing to acknowledge the truth of the charge. These men have perhaps a dim perception of the excellence of Art, and are disposed to grant a certain value to it. But what this value should be, they hardly know. They are willing to take the current estimation on trust. As curious and beautiful exercises of intellect, they deem artistic achievements worthy of toleration, and of a fair amount of encouragement. But he who has a true feeling for lofty Art would not wish to see

Digitized by Google

its honor rise on such a basis. If Art is enervating to morals or mind, or if it is in essence merely a luxury, it should not be allowed the consideration which it even now receives; let it not live to draw sustenance from nobler pursuits worthy of earnest encouragement.

But is such the case? Is Art in its true efforts degrading to humanity, or is it on the other hand ennobling and refining? To those who have studied this matter, the answer to this discriminating question should be most clear. It is the abuse of Art against which denunciation should be levelled. True Art is the exponent of mental and physical beauty and sublimity. Whatever is depraving or impure, it rejects as a perversion of itself. We acknowledge that the abuses of Art are and have been great and manifold. But they are diminishing. And if we find that the proper developement of such a power has a pure and refining influence, shall we allow its misuse, grievous as that may have been, to militate against its worth? If so, the same objection holds good against the noblest faculty of human nature. The greater the excellence, the more fearful may be the perversion.

The world in which we live is full of the most varied beauty. The skies, the trees, the fields, the ocean, the storm, the calm, sunset and sunrise, midnight and noonday, all have their multitude of attractions, each becoming nevertheless a mere unit when viewed amid the endless variety of creation. The lessons of Art teach us more fully to appreciate these beauties: and in this we speak of the most obvious, not of the highest teachings of Art. How then shall the real utility of such a pursuit be estimated? Men make certain classifications, which they term the Fine, and the Useful Arts; meaning by the former that particular department to which the present essay refers, and by the latter the strictly mechanical arts. These distinctions when taken as mere technicalities used for the purpose of orderly arrangement, are well enough. But when understood literally, nothing can be more false. Yet men are always following the idea that they can, as it were, put utility into scales, and measure it by pound and ounce weights. There are even those who would presume to compute the value of Religion in this way, if public sentiment would permit them.

Digitized by Google

Are men so awake to nature and to lofty and refined feeling, that they have no need of the teachings of true Art? Or rather, is not the contrary the case? Is there not among us a tendency to absorption in business; to a hardening of the heart, and a petrifying of the affections towards nature? The energies of the mind are wasted in social follies and party bickerings. Men cannot afford time to study the beauties of nature. Their hearts are kindled by the fires of avarice and ambition till the wide prairie-fields of the soul are in danger of being made utterly desolate. We would wish to create counter-fires: the pure fires of a noble and ennobling love, that embraces all the works of God, and from them aspires upward towards their Maker.

Denying, then, any real foundation to the prejudices, defined and undefined, of which we have just spoken, we return to our direct purpose, which is to show the proper bearing of Art upon the moral and intellectual, and even on the business-prosperity of a civilized community. In aiming to accomplish this design, we must make use of several means. Accordingly, we would turn attention, at first, to the moral and intellectual view of the subject; next, to certain relations which the practice of Art bears on the pursuits of mechanical and commercial industry; and at last, we shall present certain facts which, while they give us some idea of the value which Art has borne at different periods of past history, will at the same time afford a foundation on which we can build our hopes for the good results of its future labors.

First, then, with regard to the moral argument. No one will contend that we are constituted merely for the purpose of satisfying the animal necessities of life. We do not (or should not) live merely for our meat and drink and clothing, and for the satisfaction of animal instincts. To do this only, were to make ourselves like the beasts of the field, only that in thus doing we should make ourselves criminal in a manner of which their inferior nature is not capable. And we shall most certainly receive our deserved reward when we stifle the appeals of our moral and mental nature, or even further degrade our talents to merely sensual pursuits. It is our duty then to improve and educate ourselves, morally, intellectually, and physi-

Digitized by Google

cally. And with regard to the latter, we should be aware that the capabilities and consequent demands of our moral and intellectual nature, depend very much upon the education of our physical system, and the developement of the material resources which surround us. Nor are there wanting sufficient motives to the performance of this duty of self-improvement and self-education,—a duty which, when attended to, affords us the purest and most innocent pleasure. Among other inducements, a taste for the beautiful and the sublime in the works of nature is one of the strongest incentives to urge us on to the culture of all our powers. A love for the beautiful and the sublime is a sentiment most deeply implanted in our being. It is allied with the noblest aspirations of the soul, and is one of those sympathies by which we are most nearly connected with our Maker, through the visible works of his vast creation. The love of what is truly lofty and beautiful ennobles the mind and impels it to efforts of self-elevation. We naturally assimilate ourselves in some measure to what we truly love.

Mankind generally have a tendency to the enjoyment of the beautiful and the grand. It is said that there are some minds altogether too dull for a sense of these things. We do not believe this statement. All men have some sympathy with the creation of which they form a part; some indeed in different ways, and in greater degree than others; but I hardly believe that there is a being on the face of the earth whose bosom gives not some response to the beauty which is daily manifested in the material universe. The trouble is, that men seek to stifle these purer instincts, enslaving body and soul, too often, to the selfish and sensual habits with which they clothe themselves as with a garment.

We say, once more, the love of sweet harmonies, of beautiful and noble forms and colors, is deeply implanted in our bosoms. Why should we not then, in due proportion, foster and cultivate this department of intellect—these sentiments which belong almost to the region of moral feeling? We bring reason to the developement of moral and mental capability, and why should we deem the reasonable cultivation of taste and imagination beneath our notice? Are these feelings, these powers, mere excres-

Digitized by Google

cences of our mental constitution, or are they not rather the gift of God, intended to promote our happiness and our progress in the work of perfection?

What then should prevent a cultivation of taste and imagination, and of our love of the beautiful in nature, and in the works of Art also, for Art is but a teacher who helps us the more fully and clearly to comprehend the beauties of nature. The means of this self-education are within the reach of every member of the community, even the humblest. To be sure, in this as in every other kind of self-advancement, some individuals have advantages which others possess not at all, or at least only in a small degree. But all have in some measure opportunities to improve themselves in this respect. As for the works of nature, they are open to all. And as for the works of Art, which serve to awaken our dormant imagination, they also are carried in some shape or other, by paintings and prints, more or less perfect and spirited, into every dwelling throughout the land. And here let me not be misunderstood to give indiscriminate approval; for there is a multitude of pictures and prints scattered among us, which deserve neither the sanction of nature nor Art, being caricatures upon both. For instance (to take an extreme example,) in many a dwelling where a better taste ought to reign, side by side with the simple prints representing the Saviour and the holy apostles, — we see posted up the ludicrous caricatures on humanity, entitled Susans, Mary-Annes, or Laura-Elizabeths, as the case may be, in which flashy colors, flaming ribbons, crimped waists, and idiotic simpers, form the chief attractions. True, these masterpieces now reign only in country towns. But enter a city parlor, and it is more than an even chance that you see on the table some richly bound annual entitled perhaps 'Gems of Beauty,' or something similar, whose character is for the most part only a sublimation of the follies of its humble country cousins. The same silly simper, the same idiotic affectation, now receive the aid of the skilful graver and are accompanied by very liberal quantities of tassels, cushions and silk mantles.

Such objects, disgusting though they be to the refined and truly educated mind, yet have their lesson also. They serve as a means to show what a mass of uncultivated

Digitized by Google

perception obtains among us, when such trash as this meets a ready reception. These absurdities find response only in ignorance and perverted taste; and this ignorance must disappear when the mind has become truly educated and refined. This education and refinement is what we desire.

But to return. We hold that Art is a most efficient power in promoting a love of nature and her relations. Art is but a teacher pointing out more clearly the features of nature; and, dispersing the dim and clogging atmosphere which encircles our vision, she lays open that which we should not have discovered by the unaided sight. With the child and the totally uncultivated, the love of beauty may be called an instinct. As we grow in stature and knowledge, and bring this faculty into exercise and cultivation, like the other mental faculties in similar circumstances it gains strength and acuteness of perception. And as the fully developed man approximates the perfection of his faculties, so does he become fitted to appreciate the treasures of nature, into whose presence Art, his willing friend, stands ready to lead him. Then, while in the companionship of his teacher he wanders in the broad fields of the universe, his mind is led from contemplating the beauties of creation, to stretch upward towards its God, who is the source of all strength and knowledge and beauty. So much for one division of our subject.

As *individuals*, I think we must be aware that we have too often chained our minds within the limits of our business-pursuits, cramping them when necessity did not demand it, denying them, too often, that education which, if we wholly neglect, it were as well for the world had we never lived. Individually, then, we have been wanting. But we have been found wanting as a nation also. In attention to Art and its uses, we are behind nations whom we should deem it a disgrace to see so far beyond us in other respects. Yet we can show, in a few words, that hereafter we shall find it for our interest as a people to afford encouragement to Art, if not on account of its intellectual bearing, at least on account of its beneficial influence upon industry and commerce.

We know, then, that a familiarity with the elements of Art, such at least as drawing and perspective, and the

Digitized by Google

more simple harmonies of color, is absolutely necessary in many manufactures and *industrial* pursuits. The machinist, the builder in various materials, the engineer civil and military, and the architect, if they wish to attain any height in their professions, must have some knowledge and practice in these matters. The manufacturers of cloths, of carpets, of calicoes, and the various similar fabrics of which we make use, are obliged to employ the aid of colors and their harmonies to beautify these productions, and render them suited for the market. And a particular class of designers are employed to this purpose. In fact, it is necessary for one to enter thoroughly into the various departments of active life, to be fully aware how much those Arts, which at first sight may be thought abstracted from every-day use, influence the course of commerce and mechanical industry. The Europeans are in advance of us (as indeed from the nature of things, we should reasonably expect them to be) in understanding and appreciating these relations. France, and other transatlantic countries, have their public schools where mechanics and others are instructed in the principles of design. Any one who has informed himself with regard to the productions of the French looms, from the far-famed Gobelin tapestry down to the more humble fabrics of Lyons,—any one who knows the history of the Sêvres porcelain, or who has learned aught concerning the vast establishment of the English Wedgewood, must be aware that in the manufactories just mentioned, is employed even a high degree of artistic merit. Yet these are only examples (striking examples indeed) of a widely extended use of artistic labor in perfecting the commercial material of Europe.

We would endeavor to point out the utility of a knowledge of the elements of Art, a knowledge of fine forms and harmonious colors, to various branches of industry, and through these to the interests of the whole body social; for with the body cumulate as with the individual body, what benefits a part benefits the whole. As a nation we shall, in the future, probably find it necessary to our highest prosperity as a commercial people to pay more attention to the arts of Design than we have yet given them. When the time for this shall come, what shall be the foun-

Digitized by Google

tain-head from which is to flow the good taste, the accurate knowledge, which commercial wants may demand? Whence shall these proceed but from a proper developement of Art in the hands of a certain class, whose talents and disposition fit them to be its special professors? In the answer to such a question is contained an argument from matter of fact, from dollars and cents, for national attention to the claims of Art. Now, the fountain-head must be higher than the outlet, and if men wish to have the use of combinations of fine forms and harmonious colors for *industrial* purposes, they must derive them, whether directly or indirectly, from a higher source than merely mercenary purposes would suggest.

We have thus spoken of the moral and *industrial* bearings of Art. And now we wish to turn to another train of thought.

We wish to consider certain characteristics of the mental history of Art, ancient and modern, and the relation also which it has borne to society in ancient and modern times. If we can do this properly, it may give us some insight into the worth of Art during past time, and it will afford us some ground on which to base our hopes of its future usefulness.

The history of Art may be divided into three ages, which we may term respectively the ancient, the middle, and the modern or transition age. In commencing, we shall have little to say concerning the efforts in which forms and colors were rudely indicated in all the imperfection which attaches to untaught labor. In speaking of the ancient age of Art, then, we wish to be understood as speaking of its most complete developement, such as it was in the time of Apelles, of Praxiteles, and their contemporaries. The characteristic superiority of ancient Art was its surpassing developement of physical beauty and excellence. Living in a clime the most favorable to physical developement, and among a people who held this last to be of high worth; and whose manners and customs especially favored the study and appreciation thereof, Art in its exposition of physical beauty through Sculpture and Painting, reached a perfectness which it has seldom since reattained. The statues of the Apollo Belvidere, the Venus de Medici, the light-limbed Mercury, the Glad-

Digitized by Google

iator, the Antinoüs, and others which it would be unnecessary now to mention, have come down to us as the types of the most perfect human beauty. They are the product of the concentrated labors of the old Grecian masters, who in the study of physical beauty enjoyed a range of advantages now beyond the reach of the artist. Art became the property and the delight of the people. All classes took interest in it. They could appreciate to a great degree the transcendent excellence which shone in the works of Apelles, of Protogenes, of Praxiteles, and their contemporaries. A certain refinement of feeling was diffused through the community. The intellectual and the physical were developed in harmony. Never was the truth more deeply appreciated, that the perfection of the intellect (as a general rule) depends upon the perfection of the physical. The most intellectual people of ancient times knew (and what was still better acted on the knowledge) that, in mental as well as in physical matters, it was necessary to the highest excellence that the instruments and means by which the mind was to manifest itself, should be of vigorous material, of excellent form and adaptation, and that it were well that the outward polish which attracts the eye be by no means wholly neglected. The developement of Art in its physical and mental relations, gave to intellectual effort a wholeness of power and a fulness of scope which could not have been attained without its aid. Artistic feeling and principle pervaded all the intellectual achievements of ancient Greece. Look at Demosthenes. Is he not an artist of the highest order, whose materials indeed were words and the combinations of language, but who may be said to have developed in each of his mighty speeches an oral sculpture, where not a word nor a sentence was uttered but was instinct with the concentrated energy, the commanding self-possession, and last but not least the severe and manly beauty which still exist to us congealed in the marble treasures that time has rescued from the wreck of past ages. So it was, we repeat, in all departments of knowledge and intellectual power. The shafts of eloquence, winged by the sinewy arm of mind, shaped with skill and polished with its own proper beauty, flew straight and unerring to the mark. The Grecian poet, nerved by the lessons of physi-

Digitized by Google

cal and intellectual power and beauty which were daily presented before his eyes, wove his verse in words of fire, which, vivid and edged as the keen lightning, penetrated men's souls and informed them with electric might. The philosopher, also, though he wrought not in solid stone, yet placed the stamp of a mental sculpture upon his lessons of far-searching wisdom. Shall we say that this polished strength and skill of intellect, may be expected to exist without the concurrent aid of the finer Arts? No! As well might we, in physical matters, expect to see the mighty engines of man's invention laboring accurately and effectively at their accustomed work, yet with wheels and rods and multitudinous limbs wholly wanting in the perfecting finish which proceeds from the hand of the skilful artisan. As well might we expect to see the noble ship ploughing its way through the heaving ocean, submissive to the governing will of man, yet displaying to the eye a mass of disordered rigging, bungling blocks, and misshapen sails. In material things we need the hand of the skilful laborer, and so also it is in mental products. Uncultivated, natural and intellectual strength is indeed power, but it is, of consequence, rude and ill directed power. Yet when finished by taste and directed by educated skill, then its strength becomes almost irresistible. And this is the lesson which the history of ancient Greece ever presents to the student's eye.

Art in its middle age, although based on a true study of physical beauty, being nevertheless especially devoted to the illustration of religious sentiment, became a helpmate to religion, serving to elevate the moral feeling of the people. It was in a great measure the business of Art to act upon religious sentiment and affection. Hence the works of Raphael,—his Cartoons and his frescoes, representing the lives and deeds of Christ and his apostles; hence his Madonnas and infant Saviours. Hence the mighty achievements of Michael Angelo.

Italy at this period might in some respects be compared to ancient Greece. The influence and the love of Art extended more or less to all classes. The highest works, while they ministered to the pleasure of the intellectual few, ministered also to the refining enjoyment of the many who were comparatively ignorant. Some of the

Digitized by Google

Italian artists held a very high rank in the literature and in the intellectual movement of their age. It needs only to mention the name of Leonardo da Vinci to the student of history, in order to bring to his mind how various an influence some of these men exerted upon their times. The artist at this period, (especially in Italy,) held a higher social position than at present. Yet this alone will not prove that the real influence exerted by Art upon society, has in the least diminished.

We now come to what may be termed, by way of distinction, the modern age of Art. We can but speak briefly and we fear somewhat unsatisfactorily of this department of the history. The present might, perhaps, be properly termed the age of transition, whose character has not yet become fully developed.

The two past ages contribute to the unfolding of that day of which we may hope that we have as yet hardly beheld the dawn. The past has been glorious in its kind, but *now* we wish for something more. Our wants demand something beyond what has yet been given us. What may come in the future we know not. But we are not of those who believe in the degeneration of the human race. Does not reason show us that there is a tide of human progress which still moves on despite of every obstacle and apparent discouragement? It may be borne back at various times from various shores; but still the roll of the great ocean is onward, and on its waves float the treasures of a thousand years of human intellect and wisdom. We are told that there is a time to come when Christianity shall reign triumphant over all; "when the sound of the battle shall cease; when the swords shall be turned into ploughshares, and the spears into pruning hooks, and nation shall wage war with nation no more." And shall we believe that this glorious era is to be attained at the expense of intellect, of philosophy, of science, and of Art? Or, rather, are we not to believe that it is to be with their concurrence and their aid? Does not all past history teach us that this latter is to be the destined path? And yet there have been those who would not understand the lesson.

In past times how often has Philosophy been arraigned as faithless, Science as heretical, and Art itself been con-

Digitized by Google

demned as a corrupting luxury, tending to enervate the action of life. Are there any *now* who will believe this, and sign their assent to it as the doctrine of truth and reason? To the purblind eye which looks not beyond the scope of the present moment, which rests its dogma on its inspection of some solitary corner of the great fabric of human soul builded by eternal wisdom,—to such bigoted perceptions, we repeat, these narrow thoughts may be. But to those who by the aid of earth's long history can look forward into the future, time shall tell its own story of the onward march of human advancement. Shall Religion then, we ask, become the destroyer of Art, destroying her because that she shall be found a useless and luxurious drag upon human progress? Or shall Religion, in attaining her final dominion over all things, make use of Art as a servant and a friend, purified indeed and adorned with the reflected graces of her mistress? This is the question, and who can doubt the answer?

It may not be that the future will reproduce an Apelles, a Phidias, and a Raphael, the painters and sculptors whose works have been the admiration of the world in past ages; their peculiar excellence we may not hope to see again equalled. But may we not look for something which shall be even better; for a moral and Christianized Art, expanding its genial influences thoroughly, throughout a civilized and happy community; a community, whose members shall possess freedom, and competency, and happiness, because they have become worthy of them, morally, physically, and intellectually. There may then arise no Apelles, no Phidias, no Raphael, no Michael Angelo, no dazzling orbs of brightness blazing through a night of surrounding darkness; but in their stead shall glow the equal and genial light of day, the brightness of wide-spread knowledge and refinement, fertilizing the fields of humanity with its rays. We may hope that Art is to act on and be acted upon by the character of the age. The present is termed emphatically, the age of philanthropy. Men's minds are bent upon reform; upon alleviation of misery; upon recovering the erring and the vicious; on uniting the broken bands of universal brotherhood and sympathy; and on putting forth those efforts, in which, feeble and impotent as they may at first sight

Digitized by Google

appear, Faith sees the promise of the future reign of peace. The efforts of the rich and the high in station go forth to meet the wants of their less prosperous brethren. As year after year passes on, the poor, the unfortunate, and the degraded, come forth to the rich heritage which God has spread out for them upon the earth. The poet, the philosopher, the historian, the man of science, live in their noblest works, not for the few, but for the many. And while all these are thus employed, think you that the Painter is wholly wanting at the work? The many are yearly, and daily, and hourly, awakening and springing up to grasp the treasures which lie within their reach. The pencil, as well as the pen, is brought to bear on the humble enjoyments of the cottage, quite as much as on the pleasures of wealth and fame. A Gainsborough's picture of a "Rustic family" outshines more than one painted "Battle of Trafalgar." Art approaches to its most proper and benficent scope. We may hope that it is henceforth to deal with humanity under all phases, awakening the dormant sympathies of the soul, and, side by side with the Poet's song, sending forth its pictured lyrics of peace and joy to cheer the firesides of all the land.

We have thus barely attempted to indicate the promise unfolded in the history of Art, and also the destiny of Art as shadowed forth by the movements of the times. And we may be pardoned if we attempt to exemplify the spirit which a true study of Art is able to infuse into the mind, by a reference to the greatest artist whom America ever produced. We refer to the lamented Allston; a son, of whom his country may well be proud, a father, to whom the artist looked up with veneration, a man, of whom his fellow men may say with real sorrow, "We shall not look upon his like again!" His character was the very personation of moral and intellectual beauty, and this spirit was visible in his works. The beautiful thoughts, the imposing conceptions which arose in his mind, found fitting instrument in the hand which accurate study had disciplined to use. A lofty moral was contained in the great effort of his life; a moral which we believe will not be without its effect on the labors of his successors. With him, the *material* was servant to the *spiritual*. With him, the old dispensation of Art had

Digitized by Google

passed away, and the reign of the better had begun. His was a spirit which, amid the conflict of moral reform, responded in its own manner to the call of Peace, the forerunner of a better age. From the heterogeneous ranks of the reformers comes up the cheering cry, "Peace and universal brotherhood." "No battle-pieces for me!" are the memorable words of the venerated Allston. Moral triumphs, the victories of Christ, be henceforth the subjects of the painter. And let past Art, glorious as her achievements have been, be no longer a despotic mistress, but rather a teacher, pointing her disciples forward to a better and a brighter age.

We have thus aimed, in the best manner of which we were capable, from the means within our reach, to plead the cause of Art before the reader. We have spoken of its mental and moral, its *industrial* and physical relations. We have spoken of the beautiful and ennobling sentiments which Art in its purity has the power most efficiently to inculcate. We have endeavored to show the meliorating and humanizing influence which it is able to exert upon mankind, and how that influence is diffused from the highest to the lowest ranks of society; that we might as well despise Christianity for not having yet accomplished its work, as to condemn Art in that it is imperfect, and has not performed more than could, in the order of things, have been expected from its labors. Yet methinks there are many, very many, who, educated and refined as they may deem themselves, have not yet properly appreciated its past work and its future destiny. But the tide of earthly progress is not to be rolled back by ignorance nor neglect. The cry is still "Onward!"—and as the human masses move forward into the future, the rough numbers of their song float on before them, and their chorus still is,—"Onward, brothers; a better time is coming!" G. H. B.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXV.

The Inspiration of the Scriptures.

The religious world is in a state of commotion. We have reached one of those interesting eras when doubt and belief are desperately contending for the victory. Amid this contest, anxious minds are eagerly inquiring whether we have anything real and tangible upon which we can rest, or must we be tossed about, without chart or compass, uncertain where we are, or whither we are going. Is the Bible of human or divine origin? Can we refer to it as final authority? Or must we regard it as fallible and unworthy of absolute confidence, like all other books? Is it the inspired word of God, or the machination of human wisdom? These inquiries suggest a fruitful theme, to the consideration of which we now proceed.

In discussing it, we make no pretensions to originality. Much has been said and written upon it, and from the mass of materials before us, we shall glean whatever of truth the occasion demands. Our subject naturally presents itself under two inquiries.

I. What is Inspiration? Before we can make a definite application of this term, we must know what it means. No attentive theologian can be ignorant of the fact that it is used by different writers with different significations. What are these?

There is a certain vague manner of using this term, which is common with us. It signifies a kind of enthusiasm, earnestness, or moral heroism, which pervades the soul and leads it on to action. Each man is endowed with it to a greater or less degree, depending upon his genius, temperament, tact and talent, and the extent to which these endowments have been cultivated. Thus all men are inspired — some for one thing, and some for another. Homer and Shakspeare were inspired to write poetry; Plato and Bacon, to teach philosophy; Newton

Digitized by Google

and Euclid, to delve in mathematics; Watt and Fulton, to invent machinery; Luther and Murray, to act as leaders in reforming the world; Socrates and Franklin, to teach practical wisdom. Every person, who has a taste and talent for a particular sphere, is inspired to labor in that sphere.

It will be seen that a man thus inspired has received no new gifts since his first entrance into life. He was endowed by his Creator with certain capacities which preëminently fit him for a specific vocation. And it is also customary to say in this case, that a man is more inspired the more he improves his powers. Milton was inspired in proportion to the cultivation of his poetic genius, — the farther he was enabled to gaze into the world of thought and beauty; so the more a person cultivates his moral and religious sentiments, the farther is he enabled to enter the world of spiritual beauty, the nearer he approaches unto God, the source of all wisdom, love and truth; or, as Jesus expresses it, "the pure in heart shall see God." "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God."

This, we repeat, is the common style of speech among us. And it is all well enough, if not carried too far. We see in these instances that no new element, foreign to the mind, has been introduced, and no unusual quickening influences have been brought to bear upon it. The inspiration consists in the bestowal of powers common to all men, and in the developement and strengthening of these powers, in strict accordance with the ordinary laws of nature. One man is endowed with a particular capacity in a greater degree than another. The man of genius and imagination sees more of poetic beauty than the person almost devoid of them. The pure in heart see more of moral beauty, have a deeper insight into the spiritual world, with all its surpassing glories, than the corrupt and profane, who have neglected the cultivation of the heart. This is all true. We are all willing to acknowledge it. But when it is asserted that this is the only kind of inspiration, we are unwilling to grant it. We cannot admit that this was the only kind of inspiration which the sacred writers possessed. We cannot believe that Jesus and his disciples, Matthew and Paul, Moses and Isaiah, were en-

Digitized by Google

dowed with no inspiration except that which resulted from the natural capacities of their minds and the cultivation of these capacities. They revealed truths which no mere human talent or skill can ever attain to. They looked into the future, and gave a correct history of events ages before they took place. Moses prophesied of the state of the Jewish nation, foretold their iniquitous acts, the destruction of their capital, and their dispersion over the earth. David and Isaiah foretold the advent of Christ, his sufferings, crucifixion and resurrection, ages before he appeared upon the earth. Jesus also prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem, his own death, and other events, all of which took place in strict accordance with his description. His disciples were prophets also, as well as teachers. These facts show that they received aid from on high of a different character from that bestowed upon men generally. These prophecies could not have been made by any man, however perfect his faculties and however improved they may have been, without supernatural aid. It was only by the direct, special agency of God upon their minds that they were enabled to present them.[1] We may predict, from present appearances and the knowledge which we have of the ordinary laws that control the social and political world, with some degree of probability, the changes which will take place in the future. But we cannot give such detailed accounts as we find in the prophecies of the Old and New Testament writers. Here the most minute incidents are frequently described just as they afterward occurred, which precludes the possibility of their being foretold by the unaided powers of man. We must accordingly believe that there is another kind of inspiration than that which all men possess; a special, divine inspiration, given by God himself, to aid those commissioned with important truths, to reveal them to the world, unmixed with dangerous errors. We cannot stop here to give all our reasons for coming to this conclusion. They will appear more fully under our next head.

II. We have shown what inspiration is. We will now proceed to inquire, in what sense, and to what degree,

[1] See Universalist Quarterly for Jan. 1845, pp. 88–90, where this point is ably and clearly presented.

Digitized by Google

were the sacred writers inspired? Here is a collection, which we call "the Bible," consisting of various books of histories, travels, genealogies, essays and letters, purporting to have been written by different persons, at different times, widely separate from each other, duly authenticated and supported by irrefragable testimony, containing some of the purest sentiments and sublimest truths ever revealed to man. What was their origin? How did the writers get these truths? What is the source whence they derived them?

To answer these queries, two theories have been broached, called the theories of Plenary and Rationalistic Inspiration. The former has received a new impetus in this country by the recent work of Gaussen,[2] a Swiss divine, in opposition to the Neologists. It asserts not only that the Bible is divinely and specially inspired, but that all parts of it are equally so, and that the very words in which it is written were put into the mouths of the speakers and writers. In order that we may do justice to the advocates of this system, we will quote Gaussen's language:

"We inquire, whether the parts of the Scriptures which are inspired, are so equally and entirely; or in other words, whether God has provided, in a definite, though mysterious manner, that the very words of the holy book should always be what they ought to be, and should be free from errors. This we affirm. We inquire whether the whole Bible, or only a part, is thus inspired. We affirm this kind and degree of *all* the Scriptures, the Historical books as well as the Prophecies, the Epistles as well as the Psalms, the Gospel of Mark and Luke, as well as those of Matthew and John. . . . . In other words we aim to establish by the word of God that the Scriptures are from God, that *all* the Scriptures are from God." (pp. 33, 34.) Again he says, "We should then deem it a very erroneous statement to say certain passages of the Bible are from men, and certain others from God. No; every very verse without exception is from men, and every verse without exception is from God, whether he speaks directly in his own name, or whether he em-

[2] "Theopneusty, or the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, by S. R. L. Gaussen, Professor of Theology in Genoa. Translated by E. A. Kirk. New York. pp. 343.

Digitized by Google

ploys all the individuality of the sacred writer. . . . Such then is the word of God. It is God speaking in man, God speaking as man, God speaking for man."[3]

Such is the theory as expressed by one of its most distinguished advocates. Every book, chapter, sentence and word, is direct from God. The writers are only instruments in his hands for delivering his message to man.

We cannot adopt this theory for several reasons. We have, for instance, various trifling discrepancies in the historical part of the New Testament. There are four Gospels in which we find accounts given of the crucifixion of Christ. Matthew gives us the words of the inscription, "*This is Jesus, the King of the Jews;*" Mark, simply, "*The King of the Jews;*" Luke, "*This is the King of the Jews;*" John, "*Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.*" Now upon the theory of a verbal inspiration, how are we to reconcile these differences? Its advocates say that every word is from God, and here are four different sets of words in relation to the same thing. The Almighty certainly knew what words actually were placed on the cross. Why did he not put them into the mouths of each of the writers? The actual inscription corresponded to one of these or not. If it corresponded to one, the other three must be false, as it is not at all probable that four different inscriptions were used. We are consequently left to the alternative of pronouncing three Gospels false, in this particular at least, (and who shall decide which?) or believe that the Almighty has stated what is not true, — in either case casting ridicule upon the whole. But drop this theory, and adopt one more consonant with reason and truth, and all is plain. These variations are in accordance with human testimony, differing in the words used, but agreeing in the idea. We might treat all other variations, noticeable in the Gospels and other parts of the Bible, in the same way. They are totally inexplicable in accordance with the theory of Gaussen, yet can be readily accounted for upon the theory of general or non-verbal inspiration.

[3] Christian Examiner for July, 1842. We acknowledge ourselves much indebted to Mr. Peabody's article in this No.

Digitized by Google

Another objection to this theory is founded on the diversity of style which is seen in the Scriptures. Each book is marked by distinct peculiarities, which cannot be mistaken. The difference in the style of Isaiah and Amos is very striking. The former is lofty, dignified and refined, while the latter is lower and more common-place. He was a shepherd, and uses words and phrases pertaining to his profession; while Isaiah admits no language inconsistent with the principles of a correct and refined taste. David's style is rich and flowing, while Solomon's is brief, sententious and expressive. Matthew is formal; Mark is brief and comprehensive; Luke is heavy and scholastic; John writes from a full and overflowing heart, without paying much deference to systematic arrangement. Paul is analytic, logical, impetuous and stern in his conclusions, while James is honest, straight-forward, seemingly heedless of the tendency of his arguments. Peter is bold and fiery, while John is gentle as a lamb. The former deals largely in bold threatenings and harsh denunciations, while the latter brings out to view the amenities of his Master's religion.

Such is the diversity of style among the sacred writers. Their characters are discoverable in their writings. The individuality of each is inwrought into their form and spirit. This fact must ever stand as an unanswerable argument against verbal inspiration. It never has been, and never will be, reconciled with it.

Will it be said that God spake through the minds of the writers yet allowed their peculiar characteristics to appear in their productions? This is virtually giving up the argument. For in this case he could not, of course, have dictated every word. Man had something to do with it. While God dictated the thoughts, man clothed them in his own peculiar style. He selected his own words by which he expressed the thoughts which he had received from God, in the same manner that he would express those thoughts obtained by the ordinary operations of the mind. God does not do it all, as this theory supposes. He only assists man. He does not however give him words, but thoughts simply. This is falling back upon another foundation, quite distinct from the former. And thus every person, who recognizes diversities in the style

Digitized by Google

of the Biblical writers, must abandon the verbal theory and adopt some other. There are other arguments which might be urged with much force against this hypothesis; as, the fact that the sacred writers frequently borrow from the productions of others, and appeal to the senses for confirmation of the truth which they taught. But our space will not allow us to enlarge on this part of our subject.

We come now to the Rationalistic theory. It teaches hat

> "Inspiration is no miracle, but a regular mode of God's action on conscious spirit, as gravitation on unconscious matter. . . . . As God fills all space, so all spirit; as he influences and constrains unconscious matter, so he inspires and helps free and conscious man. . . . . It is the direct and instinctive perception of some truth either of thought or of sentiment." [4]

It appears to us that no man can reject this view of *a kind* of inspiration, using the term in its usual loose and indefinite sense. All men possess it, as we stated in the former part of this article, some in a higher, some in a lower degree. But the great error of the Rationalists consists in making this the *only kind* of inspiration. This is restricting it altogether too much. It is asserting more than finite man is authorized to assert. It amounts simply to this: God has given all men an intuitive perception of truth. As he acts upon matter, so upon spirit. He fills our souls with the light of knowledge according to the laws of our mental and moral being, in proportion to the use we make of our powers. And *because* this is so, there *can be* no other inspiration. It is improbable, yea, absurd, to expect it. This is the mode of reasoning adopted by those who profess to yield great deference to reason! How logical! How conclusive! God, who is omnipotent, cannot bring any other influences to bear upon the human mind! It is beneath his dignity! He will let men die in their sins, first!

This theory is a revolt from the old theory of verbal inspiration. But in revolting from one extreme, its advo-

[4] Parker on Religion, pp. 216-218. First Ed.

Digitized by Google

cates have passed over to another. They have gone farther than reason and probability will allow. They assume too much when they assert that there can be no inspiration except that which is natural and common to all men. In rejecting the idea that every word is inspired, we are not authorized to affirm that not even the thoughts are from God. This distinction seems to have been overlooked by them.

We are now prepared to take into consideration the third view of inspiration, which recognizes the divine origin, not of the language, but of the sentiments of the Bible. In the first place, the idea of a supernatural inspiration is in perfect accordance with reason. It is in the highest degree reasonable, that our heavenly Father should reveal unto his children those truths which are essential to their welfare and happiness, — truths which nature, or the most perfectly developed mind, unaided by a higher power, never can reach. It is in the highest degree reasonable, that He should hold communion with his dependent children and teach them the way of truth and salvation. We hold communion with kindred minds on earth; why may we not with the Father of all mercies? "We cannot deny to the Creator of man's spirit that power of direct and recognized communication with it, which he has granted to fellow-men. We cannot suppose that God has opened the soul to the inbreathings of other souls, and left us no avenue for the entrance of his own voice. No; if man has a soul, God must have a key to its every apartment, and must needs have at his command even those modes of access and forms of speech, which, for obvious reasons, he rarely sees fit to use." [5]

The world was immersed in error and darkness; sin had polluted the minds of men; goodness, benevolence, justice and truth, had fled away; dark passions raged and rankled in men's hearts. The world was waxing worse and worse, plunging deeper and deeper into the mire of moral pollution. It was meet, then, at this crisis, that God, who loved his children with an unchangeable love, should interpose to save them. It was meet that he should give them a light to guide them through the devi-

[5] Rev. A. P. Peabody, in the Christian Examiner, July, 1842.

Digitized by Google

ous ways of error, a balm to heal the wounds of sorrow, a medicine to cleanse them from all sin. All this we should confidently expect from Him who has promised to be our Guide even unto death. It would be inconsistent with his known character to neglect or refuse it. And it is not unreasonable for us to expect that He would commission human beings to make those revelations which are an antidote for all the ills that afflict humanity in the flesh. A being in human form, possessed of human attributes and sympathies, and allied to the human race, would be more likely to succeed in such a mission than any other. Here are the materials then for a supernatural inspiration; and the fact is admitted that the world needs one. Nothing else can redeem it, or prevent it from wandering farther and farther from the true way. Philosophy had been tried, but in vain. Systems of morality had been broached, but they failed in producing the desired effect. Men still hugged their brazen gods, trusted in idols, and fed on the wind and chaff of superstition. Would not God, moved by pity in the depths of his infinite soul, interpose his almighty power, fill his faithful servants with the spirit of wisdom and truth, and send them forth to reclaim that band of brothers, whom Confucius by his philosophic theories, and Socrates by his rich lessons of practical morality, could not turn from the pathway which leads down to death? All unbiassed minds must answer in the affirmative. We have then a strong antecedent probability in favor of supernatural inspiration before introducing a single positive argument in its support.

We now come to the sacred writings themselves. If we compare them with the writings of historians and philosophers, living immediately before or after the period when they were written, or indeed with any productions of mere human origin, in any age of the world, how marked the contrast! How noble, how heaven-like, the former compared with the latter! How pure their precepts! How elevated and refined the tone of their morality! How unselfish, as contrasted with the systems of men! We should expect to find, and do find, in all human systems many contradictions, not merely pretended facts conflicting with facts, but principles with principles, chains of reasoning not pushed to their ultimate

Digitized by Google

issues, theory inconsistent with fact, and conclusions widely at variance, forced upon the mind. But we find nothing like this in the Bible. There are indeed some discrepancies; but these are trivial in importance, and do not affect the general tenor of the whole. They are only the probable and necessary attendants of imperfection in language, which, as we have seen, being of human origin, is imperfect. All the essential parts, when rightly interpreted, are consistent with each other and the whole. There is no rude clashing of truths with truths, and principles with principles. "Both biography and doctrine are of one shape and hue, present a fabric entire and seamless as the Saviour's own tunic, and are throughout adapted to the higher views of their Master's mission and character, which ensued upon his departure from earth."

There is another consideration also, worthy of notice. The writers of some of the principal books were illiterate. They knew not the hidden things of philosophy, nor the subtilties of science. Yet their productions, in originality, dignity, terseness of expression, consistency and nobleness of thought, are far superior to the works of the Fathers immediately succeeding them, who were among the most philosophic and learned men of their age. These facts afford incontrovertible evidence of the divine origin of the sacred writings. If they were the result of great progress in mental and moral excellence, we cannot account for the fact that the unlearned disciples of the humble Nazarene produced works superior to those of the greatest and most disciplined minds of the age. We must receive them as coming from God.

With these arguments before us we are prepared to introduce the direct Scripture testimony in favor of supernatural inspiration. We wish to have it understood however, that our business is not now to establish the genuineness of the sacred Scriptures. This is another thing entirely. We may admit the authenticity of the Bible, and believe most of the incidents and doctrines therein taught, as many Infidels do, and yet not receive them as inspired writings, in the sense which we have explained. We are now to receive them as credible histories, just as we receive the histories of Herodotus, Livy, Hallam, and Prescott, the genuineness of which cannot be

Digitized by Google

denied, yet which are not specially inspired. We shall assume then that the sacred Scriptures are genuine in the same sense that these histories are. We do not address those who deny this. Our argument is intended for those who receive them not as fictitious, but as written accounts of real events.

Our Saviour, on four different occasions at least, promised his disciples special, divine assistance in their public labors. We quote his language: "But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour, what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." [6] "But when they shall lead you and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but whatsoever shall be given you in that same hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." [7] "And I will pray the Father and he shall give you another comforter (or helper,) even the spirit of truth." "But the helper, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." [8] In these words, Jesus promises his disciples a "special divine illumination of the minds of his disciples, and a special, divine quickening of their memories in regard to the instructions which he had given them." That it is special is seen from the words, *do not premeditate, it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak*, etc.

Among these disciples were Matthew and John. And if they were assisted in this manner in their oral instructions, how much more should we conclude that they would be assisted in their written instructions, which were to endure forever. And we learn that not only was the Holy Spirit promised to aid them in all their labors in behalf of Christianity, but the apostles themselves ascribed the same authority to their written as to their oral teachings, as we learn by referring to John's Gospel and Paul's Epistles. And we have this assurance implied in the words of Jesus. He would guide his disciples unto *all truth*, which includes the written as well as the oral, and

[6] Matt. x. 19, 20. [7] Mark xiii. 11. [8] John xiv. 16–26.

Digitized by Google

applies as well to the Gospels of Mark and Luke, as to those of Matthew and John. He would reveal unto them new truths, endow them with miraculous powers, correct their mistakes, and be with them in all their labors, to aid and counsel. It is undeniable then that the disciples of Jesus were divinely inspired.

And that the apostle Paul was so inspired, we have abundant testimony from his own writings. "The gospel which was preached is not *after man;* for I neither received it of man, nor was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." He is thus placed upon the same platform with the immediate disciples of his divine Master, having received the truths which he taught through the same medium. "Ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God." Well has a distinguished theologian said in relation to these and kindred passages: "They either mean nothing, or they denote divine inspiration in the special and exclusive sense of the word; and if St. Paul was an honest man and in full possession of his mental faculties, he was an inspired man." His words could not have been used with any degree of propriety by other men.

We have thus shown that the New Testament writers were inspired, not in the same sense that you and I are inspired, when we receive a sublime truth into our minds; but specially, supernaturally inspired, by the Spirit of God so as to lead them into a perception of God's truth, and preserve them from the errors and mistakes into which they, as fallible men, were liable to fall.

Our limits will not permit us to present in detail our argument for the inspiration of the Old Testament. It is founded, first, on the *unity* that pervades the whole. The Creator, for instance, is presented in the same character by Moses, David, Isaiah and Micah. He is the terrible Jehovah, who is clothed in the attributes of justice and power, softened however by love and mercy, who forgiveth sin, but by no means cleareth the guilty. As the Old Testament is composed of various works written by different persons, in successive ages, we cannot account for this unity unless we admit that it was the same Being speaking to them and dictating the thoughts which they uttered.

Digitized by Google

Secondly. We find here prophecies of remarkable events, written out in detail, giving an accurate description of the real events as they occurred centuries afterwards. We have touched upon this subject before and need not stop long in considering it. Suffice it to say, that they offer a proof at once tangible and irrefutable. Can man's unaided vision thus look into the future, and with the utmost precision describe the events as they are to take place hundreds of years hence? Could blind chance have thus predicted the rise, progress, and overthrow of nations, and the destinies of individuals not yet in being? "This is harder to believe than that she could paint a flower and blunder a world into being." It was God alone, the Omniscient, who sees the end from the beginning, who rules the nations and controls all the operations of the universe.

We have the testimony of Jesus and his apostles that the Old Testament Scriptures were inspired. They attributed to them infallible authority. Jesus says, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." Here he recognizes the truth of the prophecies of the Old Testament which related to him. St. Peter says, "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And that the Old Testament Scriptures were regarded as based on the same foundation as the New, and consequently possessing the same authority, is shown by 2 Pet. iii. 16, where the writer alluding to Paul's Epistles, says, "in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the *other Scriptures*, unto their own destruction." And the apostle Paul, in 2 Tim. iii. 16, is most explicit on this point: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." That the term "Scripture" includes only the Old Testament is evident from the fact that only a small portion of the New Testament was written at this time. The Greek term θεόπνευστος, rendered, "is given by inspiration of God," is found in no

Digitized by Google

other place in the Bible and is, we think, wrongly translated. It does not directly assert that all Scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, for there is no verb in the original, corresponding to the word "is." The better rendering is, "All Scripture, given by divine inspiration, is profitable for doctrine," &c.

This however does not destroy the force of the argument. It acknowledges that *some* "Scripture" is divinely inspired, without designating how much. If there is any part of the Old or New Testament which is at variance with the general tenor of the whole, or which can fairly be proved to be spurious, as the Apocrapha, the Song of Solomon, we are at liberty to reject it. As language is human and consequently imperfect, interpolations have doubtless crept in which mar the sense or change it altogether, and which we are obliged to reject. This is consistent with our theory that the thoughts and not the language in which they are presented, are inspired.

We are now prepared to answer the question, How far were the sacred writers inspired? Just so far as was necessary to enable them to accomplish the object for which inspiration was given, and *no farther.* We do not accordingly believe that all parts are equally inspired; that St. Paul was inspired, for instance, to inform Timothy that Demas had left him, and to direct Timothy to bring his cloak, books and parchments from Troas when he came to him. There was no need of a special revelation, and none was given. And we are not to expect that God will work a miracle when our bare faculties are sufficient. This is degrading his prerogative too low, and will not tend to advance the object for which inspiration was given. We believe that mere matters of fact, cognizable by the senses, the narrative and historical parts of the Bible generally, do not require that degree of divine inspiration which is necessary to aid men in teaching those doctrines which we never can learn by the light of nature, and predictions of events which were to take place in the future, and which the mere human vision, unaided by the Most High, can never discern.

We have now completed the plan which we marked out. We have endeavored to show what inspiration is, and in what sense, and how far, the sacred writers were

Digitized by Google

inspired. This is an important subject, and deserves our solemn consideration. If we, with Strauss, Parker and some others, deny even the possibility of a special, supernatural inspiration, and place the Bible on the same level with all other books in respect to its origin, we divest it of that peculiar interest which hangs around it, and turn away with our highest spiritual wants unsatisfied, and our souls filled with sadness and disappointment. We read its simple and affecting narratives, we listen to the deep sayings and startling doctrines of Jesus and Paul, we drink in the rich consolations of "the Cross and the Crown," but entranced, we suddenly stop, and a feeling of doubt comes over our souls which depresses our spirits and destroys our interest in those glowing pages. Why is this? Simply because the idea of its divinity is taken away, and its origin is involved in obscurity and doubt; God is no longer like a sympathizing guardian, holding communion with men, but dwells afar off in some obscure corner of the universe, while his children, in trouble and night, are hopelessly toiling on here.

Let us then cling to this idea of divine inspiration. It is the sheet-anchor of our faith. Without it the chief beauties of our system are gone; it is not a perfect, a sublime system of faith, resting on the eternal pillars of God's throne, but a dim and shapeless mass, shorn of its glories, with here and there a sparkling brilliant, glimmering through the rude and blackened ruins. Let us cling to it then. As a large and growing sect, we have an important duty to perform in this eventful crisis. Doubt and faith are contending for the supremacy. The former is mustering all his forces, preparatory to a vigorous onset. But we fear not. Let us do our duty and the contest is no longer uncertain. Faith with all its glories will triumph and confirm man's highest hopes. J. S. L.

Digitized by Google

ART. XXVI.

Silent Eloquence.

"Tully was not so eloquent as thou,
Thou nameless column with the buried base."

THOU wert in the right, strange, meteoric soul, whose eccentric orbit none could understand, and whose radiance was sadly dimmed by the earthly vapors its rays were powerless to disperse; yet thou wert nigh the truth in the above idea! The eloquence of language and tone is one thing; the power to impress the mind and touch the heart is another. The felicitous combination of figures, the startling declamation, the forcible gesture, are not the utterance of soul to soul — are not the channel of sympathy between heart and heart. The intellect, putting forth its energies to work upon the passions, does not exhibit true eloquence. Too much of the machinery is visible, the trick is too palpable for effect. They who sit in the stage-box, look coldly upon the tragic agonies, manufactured beneath their eye, while the uninitiated enjoy the excitement of illusion; and the intellect, that scans the by-play of another intellect that lashes itself into a passionate storm to create a sensation, calmly dissects the falsity, and despises the effort.

Strong, natural feeling seeks no sounding syllables. Powerful thought weaves around itself corresponding language. Truth is the only eloquence, and a deep and earnest conviction of it is the most forcible language of its communication. The overflowings of a soul filled with the Pure, the only Beautiful, have a power over other souls that the mere wordy orator may toil among figures and epithets all his life without obtaining. The brightest imagery of poet-dreams may be made to pass over the mental speculum coldly as the phantasmagoria of the magician, since science has disenchanted his wand. Glowing words may scintillate momentarily; they brand no records as they glitter away. Voices of faultless melody

Digitized by Google

may utter their spell; as evanescent and sweet as a harp-tone is their dying charm. Gifts of genius are but feeble adjuncts, if a selfish and unkindled heart show itself behind them. The eloquence of talent is feeble to that of a true and beautiful life. The lifting of a pale hand that has never touched a bribe, the gleam of a wan face that has laid beauty and health at the feet of duty, the language of an eye that has never flashed with unholy passion, the tones, however unmusical, of a voice that has only been heard for the good of man—these appeal to the soul with a power before which mere wordy eloquence is dumb.

Yes, mighty Poet, thou art right!—though the ruins of the Forum hear the bleat of herds, the song of the peasant, and the light mirth of the passing tourist, only, when some soul like thine, in their solemn shadow, listens to the awful voices that few can hear, as they sweep down the intervening years! There is eloquence lingering still where its living embodiment once startled a stern heart, and guided a powerful will. The classic marbles of Greece—those phantasms of the past—pale, spectral relics of a glory long departed, how they stand and muse over the majestic dead, speaking, all the while, their mute language to the thoughtful heart! Silent orators are they, the old temples, mouldering arches, and fallen pillars, that tell of a period sleeping in the shadow of ages that have arisen and piled new ideas and new institutions around its grave. Where powerful intellect rushed forth with fiery words, and bore down the passions of a stern, yet gracefully luxuriant developement of being, the palid relic lifts itself amidst the surrounding silence with an eloquence more commanding and moving than falls from human lips. Wherever the ruin lingers to tell that life *has been*—whether on the shores of the Adriatic, the Tiber, or the sands of the desert; whether the American mound utters its homily in the wild, or Stonehenge watches over the dust of those who reared its giant remains, there is eloquence filling the air—there is language to impress the heart and to instruct the mind.

Not only are the columns and fanes of antiquity endowed with voice to touch the spirit, but the fields of human struggle are eloquent also. Wherever Right has made a stand however feeble against high-handed Wrong;

Digitized by Google

wherever Faith has clasped her cross, or sung her triumphant hymn amidst billows of flame; wherever Freedom has pledged her vow, or laid her ashes; wherever the Heart has toiled and conquered, or suffered unavailingly, *there* is language that speaks to the heart as the earthquake speaks to the sea, when deep answers to deep along its hidden solitudes.

Nature is full of mute eloquence. The traveller who unexpectedly found a flower amidst the desert, held companionship with the beautiful stranger as he would have done with a long-lost and newly-found friend. It spoke to him, and his despondency gave place. He took his way onward with a heart from which the burdens had fallen, and a brow irradiated with hope and trust.

He, whom mistaken science and philosophy had overclouded with atheism, when his scalpel had unveiled a ligature in the human frame so important in its function, and so eloquent of *design*, that conviction forced itself upon his mind, fell prostrate at once before the mute teacher, and his lips involuntarily essayed their first attempt at prayer, as they faultered "God!" Science and philosophy, human lessonings had been to him but false teachers of a mournful creed; that mute reasoner, that wordless logician, fresh from the Source of intellect, looked into his soul, answered its sad questionings, and its obstinate unbelief was gone before an Intelligent First Cause.

Where is not this eloquence, this silent oratory? The ocean thunders its awful monologue to every nation, of every clime. The mountain, communing with the skies, translates their sayings to man. The cataract dashes onward like a restless Titan to battle, not with gods above, but with fiends below. The stars roll along their appointed way, while the world, tossing, seething and whirling in the vortex of unruled passion, looks up and listens to their words of unbroken calm. The smallest flower that trembles with the weight of the dew-drop, the oak, tortured into strength by fierce conflicts with the elements; the lake unruffled as a heart in the hour of prayer; the little brooklet, speeding like a departing soul away into the Unknown; all nature, all objects of art and science—these have a language of their own that overawes and impresses the spirit.

Digitized by Google

The statue, the painting, the architectural harmony, the grand in conception, the beautiful in design, and the finished in execution, all have their eloquence for the cultivated intellect, and it can translate it to the uninitiated. But the mute language of nature falls upon the heart of the unlearned with a power it cannot understand nor analyze, yet not the less a power, because the impression cannot be pictured or imparted; and one who never saw sculpture or painting, who never listened to pulpit or forensic thunder, cowers when the solemn mystery of the sky peals above him, and feels the peculiar charm of the magnificent night, when she stoops over him and speaks to his spirit her elevating and hallowing thoughts.

Wherever there is impressibility, *there* also are the objects to act upon it. The Beautiful and the Sublime reveal themselves to the soul susceptible of perceiving them; and all nature, all possible circumstances of spiritual energy and human destiny, are living, glowing eloquence for the intellect that can understand, and the heart that can feel its power. L. J. B. C.

Art. XXVII.

Emily Plater.

The Life of the Countess Emily Plater. Translated from the French edition, by J. K. Salomonski.

In an age that seems fast tending towards venality, when intellect walks unblushingly into the mart, and advertises itself to the highest bidder, and talent traffics, not only in gold and silver, but in other availibilities of fame and advancement, it is refreshing to turn to the history of a pure spirit, that only manifested itself below, by earnest self-sacrifice to abstract principle.

Rare as beautiful upon the earth are the footsteps of those who tread unflinchingly the path of conscious duty,

Digitized by Google

whether it lead to the scaffold, or the slow torture of reproach and contumely among men; who live up, as far as may be, to their *ideals*, sustained in their solitary elevation by that ideal alone, or who lay unfrosted hair upon the last pillow, with none to minister to that solemn hour but lofty thoughts, and the visions of unrealized hope, that prophecy of a future and perfect fruition. It may be urged that the patriot stands below the philanthropist, that the love of country is an inferior sentiment to that of love for the race; but freedom is the primitive formation on which all strata of beneficence must be laid, to be strong and enduring. The oppressed can never improve, the fettered cannot progress, and a people chained to the will of despotism have little to hope in the great world-movement that is gradually educing the beautiful out of dismay, and establishing order and true liberty on the chaotic remains of stern and feudal wrong. In this sense, the love of country is something more than the attachment to hills and vallies, to forests and cultivated fields,—it is the desire to be permitted to be all that God designed, and all that the capacities he has given indicate as a natural and inalienable right.

When God is heard, calling to nations in the voice of revolution, and old dynasties totter into fragments above the heaving mass that has laid moveless so long that its quietude passed for inertness, and its meekness for complete subjugation, though there might have been heard, at the same time, those low mutterings that tell of elements working below, not the less powerful because concealed; when that volcano has burst forth, and the faint warnings that found no way to the orgies of pride and luxury, have risen into appalling thunder, and the din of clashing elements blend in awful diapason,—then are heard, by the ear attuned to catch them, sweet undertones of the heart and spirit, flinging the melody of angels amongst the revelry of fiends. Sweet harp-tones from holier spheres, why are they doomed to flow amidst hopeless discords? Why permitted to utter unappreciated music to deafened ears and stony hearts, and then to die away in wasted strains?

But does that melody *thus* fade into the unknown? Do those unappreciated strains leave no remaining spell? The thunders of the earthquake cease when the heaving

Digitized by Google

nation settles into calm, whether of freedom or slavery; the uproar of anarchy has no permanence, but the echoes of these hallowed tones linger among men, as spiritual blessings; for it is a law of God, unalterable as that which regulates the universe, that the good, the beautiful and the true shall never utterly perish.

Skeptic, from thy bulwark of obstinate questioning, thou art asking *why*, in the administration of the All-Just, the spirit that lives its highest ideal, finds such stern welcome on earth; why sorrow over fruitless endeavor, the bitterness of thwarted energies and the gloom of blasted hope, should be the medium to usher it to human view? As well might we ask why the gold must be drawn forth by fire from its unworthy adjuncts of the mine, as to cavil at this mode of the developement and exhibition of spiritual perfection. The soul that is true to itself asks nothing of the material. Its life, its heaven, is within, and the melody it gives out to mortal ear is but the overflowing of indwelling harmony that it must necessarily pour forth, though, stricken by the hand of mail, it bows to disrobe itself of earthly vesture, and passes upward, singing its unbroken strain.

This memoir of the Countess Emily Plater is the history of one of those beautiful spirits who worship an ideal. She laid every hope and energy upon the altar of her country, and when the recently kindled flame of freedom was quenched by the combination of treachery and despotism, even life itself went out, as the last ray faded on that sacred altar. She had no longer a country or a hope.

If the land of Sobieski and Kosciuszko had no claim to the sympathies of every lover of the noble and brave, the young Countess Plater would win it for the country for which she sacrificed her unstained life, and to which she gave her last thought and prayer. If any thing can increase the horror of despotism that every born citizen of our happy republic intuitively feels, or can nerve the Christian teacher and voter to labor in the preservation of high, moral conservative principles in the legislation of our country, it is the spectacle of one so formed for all noble and happy exertion, impelled by those very energies to enter the listed field, and cast her silken glove in unavailing protest against the gauntleted hand.

Digitized by Google

The author of this memoir was a compatriot, a proprietor of a neighboring estate, acquainted with her from her earliest youth, her companion in arms on the plains of Lithuania; and, though not at her death-bed, held letters from those who closed her eyes. Thus the minute details he relates may be considered as well authenticated; and he writes of her with the enthusiasm of warm admiration, deep respect, and affectionate recollection.

Emily Plater was descended from an ancient family of Westphalia, one of whom, in the commencement of the thirteenth century, passed into Livonia as a knight of the order of sword-bearers to convert the people to Christianity, probably by means of that potent argument so highly valued in those days, the sword. The members of that order were sometimes the allies, and sometimes the enemies, of Poland, until the Grand Master sought the protection of that country, and in 1561 swore allegiance to the reigning monarch, when Livonia became a Polish province. From that time, it seems the Platers were good and loyal Poles, and maintained high influence. Emily was born at Wilna, Nov. 13, 1806, but a separation taking place between her father and mother in 1815, she went with her mother into Livonia to reside with Madame Lieberg, a distant relative. She is represented, as a child, to have possessed great sweetness of temper, simplicity and candor. From her earliest years she manifested different tastes from girls of her age. She had no pleasure in dolls and playthings, nor in dancing, and the music of the saloon. She required things of a serious character, and, as soon as she was of an age to direct her studies, threw aside that which was uncongenial to her character. In the lonely castle of Lixna, where everything seemed to point to the past, she grew from childhood with but few feminine pursuits, but with a soul full of the noble deeds of her country, "the free, the faithful, the generous Poland," so brilliant in her earlier, and so signally unfortunate in her modern annals.

In the history of Poland, woman stands side by side with man, in devotion and bravery; and to be a daughter of Poland was a proud title, though involving sometimes the martyrdom of heart and happiness. The few etchings in this work, of one of these examples, gives a glimpse of

Digitized by Google

high resolve, and a heroic crushing of human affections by a struggling, and suffering, yet brave spirit, the Duchess of Wurtemberg, born Princess Czartoryska. Her husband served in the armies against Poland, and she separated herself from him. Her son did the same, and she disowned him, and saw the domains of her ancestors ravaged by one of her descendants.

Emily applied herself, not only to the history of her country, but to that of other nations; and she strove to penetrate the causes of their success and overthrow, and commenced her physical training, that she might be enabled to take part in any effort of freedom in her oppressed land. She grew more weary of the etiquette and amusements of the saloon; she probably saw in them the proofs of contented slavery, and felt that the soul was not there to regenerate Poland. She loved equestrian exercise, inured herself to fatigue and danger, and the free air of forest and field were congenial to her spirit. She practised pistol-shooting, and her biographer says that her arms always were laid on her writing table, "which was covered, not with elegant trifles, but with mathematical books and instruments."

Notwithstanding these peculiar tastes, she seems to have been much beloved by all who knew her. She had "offers," too, as matrimonial propositions are termed, and, her biographer says, without being "perfect in beauty, she was well calculated to inspire sentiments of deep attachment; especially in a man who can value the qualities of the soul and mind." If the delicate and spiritually beautiful face given as hers in this volume, be a true portrait, she had large claim to personal loveliness, as well as that of mind. But no advantageous establishments, even with those she could esteem and respect, had power to win her from her devotion to Poland, and though "endowed with all those qualities which render woman almost an object of adoration, she was gentle, benevolent, susceptible of friendship and gratitude, but always a perfect stranger to the emotions of love."

In 1829 she travelled with her mother to Cracow and Warsaw, visited the relics of Polish glory of other days, and returned home with her mind still more deeply imbued with a desire to see her country free, and to aid her-

Digitized by Google

self in the work of emancipation. Her mother was taken sick soon after their return, and Emily attended her with untiring love. "Day and night, seated at the head of her bed, she watched her slightest movements, and endeavored to anticipate the least of her wishes." But those affectionate cares were in vain. Her mother died, and Emily, piously resigned, repressed every outward sign of grief, and superintended personally her funeral. Her heart now felt a void, which she endeavored to fill by performing filial duties to her remaining parent, whom she scarcely knew, and who had never sought the least intercourse with his family since their separation. She had previously devoted to his use all the little savings that her limited means allowed her, and, now that she was alone, she wished to be near him, as a dutiful and loving child. Accordingly she left Lixna, and sought an interview with him. It was without effect. All her gentle love was repulsed, and, instead of instantly abandoning her hope of being united to him, she interested some of her family in her plans, and retired to the residence of a relative to await the result.

Her health was impaired, and she was ordered sea-bathing. She went, for that purpose, to Libau, and there the news of the French revolution of July came to her. Henceforth her private life was ended. The love that seemed to be denied her in family relations was now all centred on her country, and she anxiously watched the passing events.

At length the smothered fires broke forth, and the country thrilled from centre to circumference, as with the beating of a new pulse. To the young Countess Plater, it was the advent of a great hope. The dreams of her life were about to be realized. Poland was again to be free. She could rest no longer in inactivity. Her family had suffered from Russian despotism. She had no ties. Her private goodness had rendered her beloved by nobility and peasantry, and she used her influence in the cause of her country. She maintained constant intercourse with the people, and stimulated their zeal for freedom. "She sustained the enthusiasm of undecided and weak minds," and such was the state of Poland, that a single individual

Digitized by Google

of her genius, position in society, and benevolence, could command immense influence over the people.

After having disposed their minds in favor of liberty, she set out for Wilna to concert measures with the Directing Committee, and to take instructions for her own conduct. She was coldly received, but not discouraged. Self-relying now, she planned the taking of the fortress of Dünabourg, which had a valuable arsenal, and with the weak points of the fortifications of which she was well acquainted. She made her calculations, and decided upon its practicability, relying also on the assistance of some of the military school there, with whom she had consulted.

On the 29th of March, she parted with her golden hair, assumed the military dress of a man, armed herself with sword and pistols, and began to raise her men. She was successful. The volunteers flocked to the national standard she unfurled in the public square, and enrolled themselves under her command. The next day, she seized the horses of the Dangiele Post Office, about thirty; and, with this addition to her cavalry, began her march upon Dünabourg, met a company of infantry, attacked and forced them to yield after an obstinate contest. Alarm had been given to the commander of Dünabourg, who sent two companies of infantry to arrest the insurgents. These were also attacked and routed, as the victors passed on to the fortress. But courage cannot furnish arms and ammunition, and Emily found her cartridges almost consumed in the two engagements. She advanced, relying on her *faucheurs*, or men armed with scythes, a hopeless dependence when opposed to musketry and cannonade. Her band was routed with irremediable disaster, and all the villages they had taken were recaptured and made the scenes of revengeful cruelties.

They would have probably failed in entering the fortress, if they had succeeded in reaching it, as the young men on whom Emily had relied for assistance, had been sent away.

She collected her shattered band, and uniting them under the command of her cousin, Count Cesar Plater, went to join the insurgents under Zaluzki, with a female friend. Her renown had preceded her, and all were curious to see

Digitized by Google

the female who had dared to plan such hazardous enterprises; but she was not surrounded by military prestige, and her reception was somewhat cold. "She failed to dazzle them," says the biographer. She then passed into the encampment of the free chasseurs of Wilcomir. There she was received with acclamation, and it was determined to celebrate her arrival with a little fête, which was in preparation, when it was transformed into a battle by an attack from the Russians, in which Emily displayed her usual bravery.

About this time she formed a friendship with Mary Raszanowicz, another young insurgent, that only ended in death.

There were those in the camp who wished to dissuade Emily from the dangers of war. On more than one occasion they had essayed to wean her from it. To avoid such, she and her friend passed to the corps of Constantine Parczewski.

When the Polish troops entered Lithuania, the union of both bodies of insurgents promised well for the cause. Emily was appointed Captain of the first company of the first Lithuanian regiment, which was the twenty-fifth of the line; and she now applied herself to the study of military tactics. She was a model to the men under her command, and patiently bore the burning day of June, and the chilly night. She soon saw the effect of this upon her constitution, but she shrank from no hardship, uttered no complaint, and, sustained alone by her energy and resolution, kept herself "actively employed," giving courage and hope to those around her. In the bloody affair at Kowno, she maintained her position with her usual determination; and, finally overcome by numbers, she quitted the field, through the entreaties of those who were forming a bulwark of their bodies to defend her.

But the struggles of Poland, and the life of Emily Plater were drawing to a close. Whether treason or imbecility struck the last blow to this brave but ill-regulated patriotism, "history," says the biographer, "will decide;" but "disasters and ignominy were in the path of the Polish leaders." After two more engagements, many mistakes and mischances, there was a division of the army into three corps. Most of them chose to follow Chlapowski,

Digitized by Google

relying on his honor and capacity, among whom were Emily Plater and Mary Raszanowicz; and when it was said that he had avowed his belief in the impossibility of reaching Poland in safety, and his determination to throw his army under the protection of Prussia, Emily could not believe it. She went to the tent of Chlapowski, and when he confirmed it, she reproached him with his base betrayal of the trust reposed in him, of his betrayal of the cause of his country, of freedom and of honor. She avowed her intention to force her way through the Russian battalions to offer her sword to her country, or perish in the attempt.

She collected her friends, related that scene, and that same evening left the army, accompanied by Mary Raszanowicz and Cesar Plater. The next day Chlapowski gave up his sword to the Prussian authorities.

Weary, dejected, yet unsubdued in their resolve, the three friends pursued their tedious journey to Poland, disguised in the peasant dress of the country. Emily was taken ill in a few days, but concealed her sufferings in the hope to reach Warsaw, and look once more on the Polish standard. But in vain; she fainted on the way, and was carried insensible into the cottage of a Samogitian forester. When she recovered, she told them her death was near, and urged them forward to offer their services to their country. "As for me," she said, "my career is ended. Grieve not for poor Emily. She well knows how to die." Count Cesar Plater, alarmed at the danger of his cousin, and not willing to leave her in the hut of the forester, where she could not receive the attention her illness required, applied to the proprietor of the village to receive her into his house, where, under an assumed name, she experienced the kindest care and best medical attention. He resumed his journey, while Mary Raszanowicz remained with Emily. Quiet and care were beginning to restore her, when the news of the final crushing of every hope for Poland, came to her ear, notwithstanding all the efforts of her friends to prevent it. Her heart was broken. The world had lost its beauty. The dreams of her life had fled, and the visions, that were as the breath of existence, had gone out in the "blackness of darkness," and she only wished to depart. Feeling her last hour approach, she received the consolations of religion, in submission to the holy will

Digitized by Google

of God. She then asked for her arms. She seized them with feeble grasp, and a tear escaped her. She requested that they should be laid in the grave with her, and her last breath was a prayer for her suffering compatriots, who, less fortunate than herself, remained exposed to tyrannic vengeance.

She departed on the 23d of Dec., 1831, in her 26th year; and, the country being in possession of the enemy, her remains were privately buried. A wooden cross only was placed at the head of her grave, since replaced by a white stone slab. The only epitaph on it is the word, "EMILIA."

It were sad if such a memory should perish. The world is a loser when the track of a pure spirit fades amidst the crimes, the weaknesses, and every day interests of life. The daughters of America, who read this book, will devoutly thank the Supreme, that their lot is cast where woman is never urged, by her highest impulses, to tread with feeble footsep the field where man should never be found except in defence of human rights.

L. J. B. C.

ART. XXVIII.

Rise and Prevalence of Unitarian Views among the Universalists.

We said, in a former article,[1] that the Universalists of this country have, for the most part, dissented from the doctrines of the Trinity and Vicarious atonement, ever since about the year 1805. The dissent began among them, still earlier; but from that time, they have generally held, and openly maintained, Unitarian sentiments on these points. This fact, we perceive, is not commonly recognized, out of our Connection. We suppose it, in-

[1] Art. VI. in our No. for January, 1848.

Digitized by Google

deed, to be well enough known that such is the case with our body at present; but it seems not so well known abroad, that there has been, in this respect, no material change with us for the last forty years or more, and that we stand on the same ground, now, that we did in the beginning of this period. The fact is obviously of some consequence in dogmatic history. It has important bearings, which need not here be particularized, on the progress that liberal doctrines, so called, have made in the community at large; and it is easy to see that any view, which leaves it wholly out of account in the causes of this advance, especially among the common people, must be defective, and be likely to suggest some wrong counsels for the present, as well as to occasion some wrong calculations for the future. We will describe the case as clearly as we can.

Let it be observed, in the first place, that questions concerning the Trinity and Vicarious atonement have always been regarded and treated, by the main body of Universalists, as quite subordinate to their distinguishing tenet of the eventual salvation of all men. This may account, in some degree, for the oversight we have mentioned; since the preëminence they have given to the latter, may have left the public to overlook or forget the part they have taken in the former. It was natural that it should be so. The doctrine of Universal Salvation is, in itself, of such vital interest to all the deeper feelings of the human heart, and it throws so peculiar a light on all the great topics of religion, that it will, we think, stand foremost in the common-sense of mankind, wherever it is explicitly and earnestly presented. There are few things which awaken at once a more lively interest in the unsophisticated mind, than the ultimate condition of ourselves and of our race. What can compete with this? We do not underrate the importance of other points in Christian research. Whether God exists in three persons or in one person only, whether Christ is God himself or only the Son of God, whether his death and sufferings were penal or simply incidental, — are questions of great moment, if not in themselves, at least in systematic theology. And when the spirit of inquiry takes its rise in the schools, or among regular students in divinity, it is natural enough that these points,

Digitized by Google

and others of the kind, should be the first to come into scrutiny, since they are so intimately connected, both intrinsically and historically, with philosophical speculations. Nor is it strange that, when the process of investigation has once begun at them, they should be ever afterwards regarded as the informing centres from which light is to radiate out over the whole field, as the test-questions, by which other things are to be compared and adjusted. For they certainly have a far-reaching influence, in the strictly scientific developement of doctrines, and by their legitimate tendency they go to determine the general theory of Christianity.

Still, we ought to observe that, even in this respect, the bearings of Universalism are equally extensive, affecting nearly or quite the whole circle of our religious ideas. Neither God nor the creation can appear the same to us, when seen through this medium, as when contemplated in the prospect of eternal misery. It is a case in which the principles involved are of so determining a force, that they must work out through the whole system, and assimilate every thing to themselves. We think, too, there needs but an impartial judgment to discover that the decision which Universalism exerts on our views of all the most vital truths, is more direct and immediate than any which simple Unitarianism can bring to bear,—we mean, on our views of the character of God, of the nature of his government, and of the sacred relations of man to man. Whether we shall really feel that "God is love," or that he is only love in part, depends on the conduct, the economy, we attribute to him, not on the epithets we apply to him. This is a consideration which careless thinkers are apt to overlook, while a secret sense of deficiency in the object of their worship, impels them to make up for the lack by the abundance of their eulogy. Assume that God has brought creatures into being who will be losers by their existence,—assume that his admistration of the Universe is of such a tenor that some will suffer eternally in his economy; and we may, to be sure, still call him infinitely good; but the dark fact which we have admitted underlays all that phraseology, and interprets it for us. Mere adjectives never deceive the heart; nor can they perpetually deceive the understanding, when the substantive real-

Digitized by Google

ities are known. Assume that mankind are, hereafter, to be permanently separated into different classes, with no sympathy between them during eternity; and that fact will ever stand up in our consciousness under all our verbiage about their essential brotherhood. It is the ultimate result of the divine economy, and the everlasting condition of our race, that must, according to the fixed laws of thought, eventually determine the whole in our mind.

We make these remarks to show, what we do not know is doubted, that this question is of superior importance, even when it is considered scientifically, after the method of the schools. It should be observed, however, that the sect of Universalists did not arise in the schools, nor on merely scientific grounds. This fact must be kept in mind, in order to understand our history, or to appreciate our position. It arose among common thinkers, and out of the intense want, so widely felt, of a gospel that should, in reality, be "good tidings of great joy to all people." The heart imperatively demanded the salvation of the whole race, as well as of one's own self, and the final extinction of sin and evil from the universe. We need not say that, to the feelings and to the religious sentiments, no metaphysical question can rival the interest of this. When the assurance broke upon the mind, it came like a single beam of pure light piercing through a firmament of darkness. There was no time, indeed no disposition, to analyze it scientifically, and to bring other objects into harmony. It was seen; and that was enough. Its relations and dependencies were not, at first, attended to; for the thoughts and the affections were too much concentrated on that one glorious truth, and too much engaged in exhibiting it, to allow of critical inquiries into its bearings on other points.

Accordingly, as we have shown in the former article, its first preachers and converts retained, in most respects, the systems of doctrine they had previously held. With Mr. Murray, Trinitarianism and the notion of a full penalty suffered by Christ, were the basis of Universalism. His Trinity, however, was that of Swedenborg rather than that of Athanasius, and his views of the "great ransom," those of Relly, in distinction from those of Calvinists. Mr. Winchester was a Trinitarian and a believer in Vi-

Digitized by Google

carious atonemeat according to the Orthodoxy of his day. The few other preachers and advocates, of that period, either followed one of these two eminent men, or held notions not very dissimilar to theirs.

The earliest date, at which we can fix an open dissent among them, is 1795. A clergyman, who was for a long period one of the most distinguished ornaments of our ministry, remembers to have heard Mr. Ballou, now of Boston,[2] argue against the doctrine of Vicarious atonement, in a sermon he delivered that year at Sturbridge, Mass., and to have conversed with him, after service, on the novel grounds he had maintained in his discourse. So far as we can learn, Unitarian views of God and of atonement gradually spread among the Universalists, from this time onward, without producing actual schism; though frequent debates are said to have occurred in their intercourse, and one or two fathers in the Connection were much offended at the growing change. We find nothing published by them, in the way of argument on the subject, till some years afterwards. Whatever may have been the prejudices of a few, the body at large was always disposed to the freest accommodation with respect to these secondary points. In September, 1803, the General Convention of Universalists felt obliged, by a recent decision of the Supreme Court of New Hampshire, to distinguish its members and societies from other sects, by a Professsion of Belief; and in the article which relates to the subjects we are considering, we find the language so guarded as to give offence neither to the Trinitarian nor to the Unitarian believers: "We believe," says the Convention, "in one God, whose nature is love; revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of grace; who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness."[3] It is known that Unitarian sentiments had, at this time, made considerable progress in our Connection, and that they were fast becoming prevalent, while still the chief attention was devoted to the doctrine

[2] Whenever we speak of Mr. Ballou, in this article, we mean Rev. H. Ballou, of Boston.

[3] Art. II. Manuscript Records of the General Convention of Universalists. See also Whittemore's Universalist Guide, p. 18.

Digitized by Google

of "the grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men." The next year, 1804, the first edition of Mr. Ballou's "Notes on the Parables" appeared, in pamphlet form, at Randolph, Vt. Though they contain no explicit denial of the old views, a careful reader will perceive that they recognize Christ merely as the Son of God, and his death as a necessary means only in the process of his enterprise. On other topics, they abound in forms of expression, and even in thoughts, retained from Calvinistic, Rellyan and mystical creeds, the elements of which were by no means defecated, as yet, from the new system that was coming into consistence.

In 1805, Mr. Ballou published, at Randolph, Vt., his "Treatise on Atonement;" a book, which has had greater influence perhaps than any other in forming the opinions of Universalists, and which, for a long time, was one of the chief instrumentalities in spreading their doctrine. Young as we were, we faintly remember the eagerness with which it was sought on its first appearance, and the confidence with which its arguments were repeated as unanswerable. It has since passed through numerous editions. Its principal object was to prove Universalism, but on a system very different fom the old. Accordingly, part of the work was devoted to a refutation of Trinitarianism and the notion of Vicarious sufferings. In his Preface, the author says, "What I have written on the subject of the "Trinity, is mainly to show the reader in what light I view "the Mediator, that my general ideas of atonement may be "easier understood. And though I think my objections "and arguments against the common idea of three distinct "persons in the Godhead, who are equal in power and "glory, to be unanswerable; yet it was not my intention "to attend to a full refutation of those ideas, as I think that "has frequently been done, and well done."[4] We take the following from the second division, in which the nature of atonement is discussed.

"Christian divines, in general, have agreed in supposing sin to be an *infinite evil*, being a violation of an *infinite law*, and, there-

[4] Treatise on Atonement. Preface, p. vii. I quote from the Portsmouth edition, 1812. The work has never been revised and corrected, though it ought to be.

Digitized by Google

fore, that the law required an *infinite sacrifice;* short of which, no atonement could be made; that the transgression of Adam brought the whole human race into the same situation of sin and misery, and subjected them all to the *infinite penalty* of an *infinite law*, which they had violated in their parent, before they individually existed. After the above agreement, many different roads are taken; and divines of the greatest abilities, and of the first rank among the literati, have drained the last faculty of invention, in plodding through the dark regions of metaphysics, to bring up a *Samuel* to explain the *solecism* of *satisfying* an *infinite dissatisfaction.*

"The plan of redemption, as held by many, may be reduced to the following compendium. God, from all eternity, foreseeing that man would sin, provided a Mediator for a certain part of his posterity, who should suffer the penalty of the law for them, and that these elect ones, chosen by God from the rest of mankind, will alone be benefited by the atonement; that, in order that the sacrifice might be adequate to the crime for which the sinner was condemned to *everlasting* or endless suffering, God himself assumed a body of flesh and blood, such as the delinquent was constituted in, and suffered the penalty of the law by death, and arose from the dead. By this process, the demand of the law was completely answered, and the debt due to Divine Justice, by the elect, was fully and amply paid. But that this atonement does not affect those who were not elected as objects of mercy, but that they are left to suffer *endlessly* for what Adam did, before they were born. It is true, they are a little cautious about saying, that *God himself absolutely died!* But they say, that Christ, who was crucified, was *really God himself*, which must, in effect, amount to the same thing. And in fact, if the Infinite did not suffer death, the whole plan falls, for it is by an *infinite sacrifice* that they pretend to *satisfy* an *infinite dissatisfaction.*

. . . . . .

"I have already sufficiently refuted the idea of an infinite sin; which opens to a plain path, in which the mind may run, and run clear of all those perplexities which have served to confuse rather than enlighten mankind. If sin be not infinite, the dissatisfaction occasioned by sin is not infinite; therefore an infinite sacrifice is not required. But, for the sake of illustration, we will for a moment admit, that the doctrine of atonement stands on the ground over which we have just gone. I will state it as it is often stated by those who believe it, which is, by the likeness of debt and credit. The sinner owed a debt to Divine Justice, which he was unable to discharge; the Divine Being cannot, consistently with his honor, dispense with the pay, but says, I must

Digitized by Google

have what is my due; but as the debtor has not ability to pay the smallest fraction, Divine Wisdom lays a deep-concerted, mysterious plan for the debt to be discharged. And how was it? Why, for God to pay it himself!

"My neighbor owes me an hundred pounds; time of payment comes, and I make a demand for my dues. Says my neighbor, My misfortunes have been such, that I am not the possessor of the smallest fraction of property in the world; and as much as I owe you, I am worse than nothing. I declare to him, positively, that I will not lose so much as a fraction of the interest, and leave him. A friend calls, and asks me how I succeeded in obtaining my dues of my neighbor; I reply, my neighbor is not, nor will he ever be, able to pay me any part of my demand. My friend says, he is sorry that I should lose my debt. I answer, I shall not lose it. I have very fortunately, in my meditations on the subject, thought of a method, by which I can avail myself of the whole, to my full satisfaction; and I think it is a method which no person in the world, but myself, could ever have discovered. My friend is curious, and impatient to know the mighty secret, never before found out. The reader may guess his confusion, on my telling him, that, as I have that sum already by me, I am now going to pay up the obligation, before the interest is any larger! This has been called the gospel-plan, which contains the depths of infinite wisdom!

"I should be pleased to see, what I have never seen, professors following such example in obtaining what the poor widow, the fatherless, and the needy, owe them. But, says the advocate for the plan, a *distinction* ought to be made *between* the *persons* in the Godhead. It was the second person in the Godhead, who paid this infinite debt to the first; therefore, it is not altogether like a person paying his own demand. I say, in answer, if the first and second persons in the Godhead are not so essentially one as to make the debts due to one, belong equally to the other, and payment also, they are not so essentially one, as to be represented by two distinct persons, related only by Adam, who are in Co. in merchandise. But, for the sake of carrying the argument still further, I will admit this *variety* of persons in an *infinite indivisible Being!* and also the plan of atonement on the principle of the second person's paying the demand to the first. And here it will be necessary to introduce the *third person* in the Godhead, as it is contended that the third person makes known to the debtor, what the creditor determines concerning him. Then the plan of the doctrine may be represented by the following similitude: A owes B the sum of one thousand pounds; the time of payment comes; demand is made; A is not worth a farthing,

Digitized by Google

neither is it in his power to raise a fraction of the money. B immediately commences a process against A, of which C, a friend of A's, being informed, goes to B, asks him how large a demand he holds against A; B informs him, a thousand pounds, and the interest. And is A worth nothing? asks C. Nothing, answers B. Would you make a deduction of twenty-five per cent, if you could have the money down? asks C. Not the least deduction, answers B. You will, at least, throw in the interest, says C. Not the smallest fraction, answers B. Well, says C, if you have no *mercy* on the *poor* and *distressed*, I will have the *pleasure* of *relieving* the *debtor alone;* counts out the money in full, and receives the obligation to bestow on his friend, A. B sends a servant immediately to inform A, that he has concluded to forgive him the debt. A is transported at the news, flies to tell his wife and children the tidings of mercy, and all join in praising such heavenly benevolence. C comes in, the same moment, with the obligation in his hand; modestly gives it to A, desiring him to accept it as a token of undissembled friendship. A is *confounded*, asks C how he came by the obligation; C informs him, that he paid every farthing of the money for it; the creditor would not make the least deduction. I leave the reader to judge, whether the creditor showed any mercy to the debtor, and whether B's pretensions of favoring A, do not wear the appearance of hypocrisy. It is contended by those who hold to this debt, and the payment of it, that the salvation of the sinner is by being forgiven; yet, they contend that the debt is paid. But how I can forgive a man a debt, and oblige him to pay it, is more than I can see.

"Again, admitting the system true, I wish to inquire into the propriety of an innocent person's suffering, for one who is guilty. It is scripture, reason, and good law, never to condemn the innocent, in order to exculpate the delinquent," &c., &c., pp 71–75, *Portsmouth edition.*

"I shall now invite the attention of the reader to another system of atonement, which was undoubtedly formed with a view to shun the absurdities in the former, and to get rid of some of the consequences that were naturally deducible from that idea of the sufferings of Christ. This system supposes, that the atonement by Christ was not intended for the salvation of any part of the human race; that its main end, and sole object, was the glory of the Supreme Being, as manifested in his holy and righteous law. In support of this plan, it is argued, that it is inconsistent for infinite wisdom and goodness to prefer an inferior object to a superior one; that all creation, when compared with the Creator, sinks into nothing, bearing no possible proportion to the infinite

Digitized by Google

Jehovah; of course, that God always has his own glory in view, as his supreme object, in all he does.

"This plan agrees with the former, in supposing sin to be of infinite magnitude, and deserving of endless punishment; that, as the law of God is infinite, like himself, finite man is infinitely to blame for not fulfilling all its requirements; and that the penalty of the law is endless misery, which misery Christ sustained; not with a view of acquitting the sinner, nor in room and stead of the transgressor, as is supposed in the other plan; but for the honor of divine justice, and the glory of his Father. It is further argued, that by Christ's suffering the penalty of the law, justice is as fully satisfied, as if all mankind had been made miserable for an eternity. And this being the case, it is now just and right for God to acquit as many of the sinful race of Adam, as is consistent with his grand object, which is himself; yet, by no means rendering it unjust for God to punish, to all eternity, as many as is necessary, in order for the satisfying of the same grand object.

"I first inquire into the propriety of the argument, on which this plan of atonement seems to be founded; which is, that God always acts for his own infinite and incomprehensible glory; never stooping so low, as to act with an intention for the good of his creatures. 1st. I ask, is God as infinitely glorious as he can be, or not? If it be answered, that he is; then, if his object in all he does, is to augment *his own* glory, he never has, nor will he ever accomplish his intention. If it be argued, that it is not to augment his own glory, but to secure it and maintain it in its proper splendor, it argues it to be of a perishable nature, and that it would decay, were it not for the continual vigilance of the Almighty in preserving it. If it be argued that neither of these objects is right, but that it is the manifestation of his glory to intelligent beings, which is the grand design or object of God, in all his acts, without any reference to the effect which this manifestation has on those to whom it is made, I say, the object has now dwindled into annihilation; there is not the smallest imaginable atom of it left. To suppose, that any rational being can wish, or desire, to accomplish any piece of labor, without having any reference to the consequences, is too glaringly absurd, to need refutation. Now the nature of the proposition, which I am examining, confines the motive of Deity within himself, and himself from his creation. In order, therefore, to look at the Almighty as he is by this doctrine represented, we must look at him as destitute of a creation, and view him abstractly from all his creatures. . . . . To say that the Almighty has, or ever could have a motive, in action, that did not embrace every

Digitized by Google

consequence that could arise from what he did, would be limiting his omnisciency; or, to say, that he did not intend good, to all whom his acts concern, would be limiting his goodness, and an impeachment of his justice.

"I have before, in this work, contended, that all the attributes which we ascribe to God, we call *good*, on account of the advantages which we derive from such principles. We are told of a God who acts for his own benefit, abstractly from his creation; and that, in millions of cases, he finds it most for his glory to make his rational, hoping, wanting creatures endlessly miserable; and this is called *goodness*. We are likewise told of a devil, who acts for his own gratification, and who delights in making God's creatures miserable; and this is called *badness*. But, for my part, according to such statements, the difference between goodness and badness, is so small, I can hardly distinguish it. It is profane, in my opinion, to attribute a disposition to the Almighty, which we can justly condemn in ourselves. A man, who should act from such a selfish principle as is attributed to God, would render himself wholly unworthy of the protection of common law. And shall we thus represent our kind and merciful Father, from whom ten thousand streams of goodness continually flow to his wanting and needy creatures. . . . . .

"Although I think I have given unanswerable reasons, why I do not admit such a penalty as I have examined, I will for the sake of the argument, still further allow it, and inquire into Christ's suffering it. To say, that Christ *has suffered* such a penalty is a contradiction in terms, because an endless duration has not yet expired. To say, that this penalty ever will be *suffered* by Christ, or any other being, is another contradiction in words; for an endless duration will never expire. Then to say, that such a penalty has been, or ever will be suffered, is erroneous. If it be argued, that Christ was an *infinite* person, and, therefore, could suffer an endless punishment in a few moments; I answer, it is not shunning the contradiction. If the position be moved, and the argument is, that he, being *infinite*, could suffer as much, in a few moments, as *all* mankind would to an endless duration; I ask, are there more *infinite* beings than one? All answer no. I ask, again, is it possible for that infinite Being to suffer? Even from my opponent, the answer will be, that the infinite himself did not suffer; but that it was the finite nature which suffered, and was raised from the dead, by the infinite; that it was the *human nature* which was made a sin offering; and that the divine nature gave victory to the human, by raising it into an immortal life. Well then, the sufferings were

Digitized by Google

finite, and could by no means answer the requirements of an *infinite* penalty."—pp. 87–96.

Afterwards, the author proceeds to argue, affirmatively, that atonement is reconciliation; that if it were God who was the unreconciled party, he never could be reconciled, since he is unchangeable; that, on the contrary, it is man who is unreconciled, and who needs the atonement or reconciliation; that the atonement by Christ is not the cause of God's love to man, but the effect of it; and, finally, that it is only by a figure that the blood and death of Christ is said to be our ransom or justification. The illustration of these points, especially of the last one, is not always clear, being sometimes obscured by Rellyan fancies, or at least by phraseology of that kind; but the general grounds he occupies, cannot be mistaken by the most careless reader.

Let us now look at the position he takes with respect to the Trinity. Speaking of those who hold the doctrine of Vicarious atonement, he says,

"They all contend, that the Mediator is *really God;* that the Godhead consists of *three distinct persons*, viz. *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost;* that these *distinct* persons are equal in power and glory, and *eternally* and *essentially one!* The reader will observe my usual mode of reasoning, which is to admit, as truth, what I wish to oppose; and to oppose it, with the consequence which necessarily follows. For the sake of argument, then, I admit the foregoing statement of the character of Christ to be just; and then I contend, that if he be the *Son* of *God*, he is the *son* of *himself*, and is his own father; that he is no more the *Son* of *God*, than *God* is his *son!* To say, of two persons, exactly of the same age, that one of them is a real son of the other, is to confound good sense. If Jesus Christ were really *God*, it must be argued, that *God really died!* Again, if the Godhead consists of *three distinct* persons, and each of those *persons* be *infinite*, the *whole Godhead* amounts to the amazing sum of infinity multiplied by three! If it be said, that neither of these three persons alone is infinite, I say, the *three together*, with the addition of a *million* more *such*, would not make an *infinite being*."—pp. 99, 100.

"I have already stated some of the absurdities contained in the opinions of most Christians, respecting the Mediator; I shall

Digitized by Google

now be a little more particular on the subject. I shall contend, that the Mediator is a *created dependent* being. That he is a created being, is proved from Rev. iii. 14, where he is said to be 'the beginning of the creation of God.' His dependency is proved, by his frequent prayers to the Father. That he acknowledged a superior, when on earth, is evident, from many passages which might be quoted. See St. John v. 19. Christ here says, 'The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do.' He acknowledged a superior in knowledge, see Matthew xxiv. 36. 'But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.' This passage implies, that he did not know of that day himself. St. Mark is still more explicit, see chap. xiii. 32. 'But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father.' And further, that he acknowledges a superior, even in his risen glory, may be proved from his own words to his servant John, on the Isle of Patmos, see Rev. iii. 12. 'Him that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of *my* God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from *my God*, and I will write upon him my new name.' Four times, in the above passage, he acknowledges a being whom he worships. Again, see Psalm xlv. 7. 'Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, *because* God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.' The reader will observe, I have ventured to put the word *because*, in room of the word *therefore*, in this quotation; but I have not done it, without the authority of a former translation. The difference is so essential, I cannot dispense with it. Observe, the writer of the Psalm addresses one God, and speaks, in his address, of another, see verse 6, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.' This God is dependent on another, expressed in the 7th verse, *Because* God, thy God hath anointed thee, &c. That the names, *God*, *Lord*, and *everlasting Father*, are applied to Christ, I shall not dispute; neither shall I dispute the propriety of it; but I do not admit, that they mean the self-existent Jehovah, when applied to the Mediator. In the quotation from the Psalm, Christ is said to be anointed *above his fellows*. Fellows are equals. Who are Christ's *equals?* Perhaps the reader may say, they are the Father and the Holy Spirit; but I can hardly believe, that Christ was anointed with the oil of gladness above his Father, neither do I believe any one will contend for it. I am sensible, that God speaks, by the prophet, of smiting the man who is his *fellow;* but this fellowship must be different from the one just

Digitized by Google

spoken of, and stands only in an official sense. The reader will then ask, if I would consider the Mediator no more than equal with men? I answer, yes, were it not, that our Father and his Father, our God and his God, hath anointed him above his fellows. See Philippians ii. 9. 'Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.' For this exaltation and name, he was dependent on his Father, and received them from him. This name, which is above every name, is the name of God, named on Jesus. It will be said, Christ taught the people, that *he* and his *Father* were *one*. I grant he did, and if that prove him to be essentially God, the argument must run further than the objector would wish to have it. See St. John xvii. 11. Christ prays that his disciples may be *one*, even as *he* and the *Father* are *one*. The oneness of the Father and Son, is their union and agreement in the great work which he has undertaken; and he prayed that his disciples might be as well agreed in the gospel of salvation, as he and his Father were; see verse 18. 'As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I also sent them into the world.' The Father of all mercies sent his Son Jesus into the world, for a certain purpose; and there was a perfect agreement between them, in all things. He says, he came not to do his *own will*, but the *will* of *him* who sent him. And again, My meat and drink, is to do the will of him who sent me, and to finish *his* work.

"The President of the United States sends a minister to negotiate a peace at a foreign court; this minister must conduct according to the authority which he derives from him, by whom he is sent; and as far as he does, he is, in his *official character*, the *power* that sent him. It is evident, Christ *received* the *power* which he exercises in the work which he hath undertaken, and that his *kingdom* was *given* to him, which goes to prove that he did not eternally possess them; see Dan. vii. 14, 'And there was *given* him dominion and glory, and a kingdom.' According to the prophecy here quoted, the dominion, glory and kingdom of Christ were *given* him. The people whom he is to rule are *given* him, see Psalm ii. 8. 'Ask of me, and I shall *give* thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.' St. Matthew xxviii. 18, Jesus saith, 'All *power* is *given* unto me in heaven and earth.' Chap. xi. 27. 'All things are *delivered* unto me, of my Father.' These and many more passages are found in sacred writ, in support of the dependence of the Mediator on the Supreme Eternal, and that he derives his power and glory from him. But if Christ be essentially God, all these scriptures seem without just signification." pp. 116–119.

Digitized by Google

We are not well enough acquainted with the foreign works that had previously appeared in the great Unitarian controversy, to know whether the manner, in which these subjects were here treated, was original; but we have been often reminded of the "Treatise on Atonement" in reading some of the subsequent American writers against the doctrine of Vicarious sufferings. It is hardly necessary to say that arguments, such as we have quoted, addressed so directly to the common-sense of mankind, so simple and yet sharp as cannon-shot, were remarkably effective in beating down the old system. They became, at once, the common property of the Denomination.

It has always been understood among us, on the authority of contemporary preachers, that, about the time when this treatise was published, or shortly afterwards, Unitarian views of God and atonement pervaded the Universalist ministry, with but few exceptions. Mr. Murray at Boston, and Mr. Mitchell at New York, were indeed strenuously opposed to them; and probably a large part of their congregations shared more or less in their prejudices. Perhaps two or three other preachers were undecided. We must add that many of the older believers, among the laity, retained to some extent Calvinistic and Rellyan notions even down to a period within our own distinct recollection; and it is natural to suppose that great numbers of the new converts to Universalism brought over with them the general forms of thought to which they had been accustomed, on every thing except the salvation of all men. Still the current appears to have been every where setting towards more rational grounds. With the main body of preachers, there was no longer any doubt; and with their characteristic frankness and vehemence, they never spared the errors which were held so sacred in the popular creeds, and which had at first gathered around their own distinguishing tenet. We see proof of this, in the few publications they sent forth, from time to time. It is remarkable that the most of them contain something on these points, notwithstanding the greater urgency with which a still more important topic was enforced. The position, that was held by our ministry, will be apparent from the examples which follow.

In Mr. Ballou's sermon at the ordination of Mr. Knee-

Digitized by Google

land at Langdon, N. H. in 1805, we find the inferiority of the Son to the Father, recognized, (p. 10,) though the preacher still held that God committed the work of creation to Christ. Again; Mr. Kneeland's sermon before the Northern Association of Universalists at Bridport, Vt., in 1807, begins thus:

"Much has been written, and much more has been said, in our world, to prove that mankind were under an infinite law, produced by infinite authority, and that every transgression involved them in infinite guilt, being infinitely criminal, and incurring infinite displeasure, and consequently deserving infinite punishment; that this law has been transgressed by Adam, the head and representative of all his posterity, involving them all in an infinite debt, which neither he nor they would ever be able to pay; but, that divine justice should not be injured, nor all mankind be wholly lost, infinite wisdom cogitated the glorious plan of satisfying an Infinite Being, who was infinitely dissatisfied! To effect which glorious purpose, God himself, in the second person of his Godhead, had condescended to be born of a woman, to take this infinite debt upon himself, and to offer himself a sacrifice, to make out an infinite atonement, to appease almighty wrath and reconcile an angry God! Not, however, absolutely to deliver or restore any of the human family, but only to show an infinite hatred to sin, and open a way whereby he could have mercy on those who would repent, and also display his vindictive justice on the finally impenitent, and his own character remain unimpeachable. And yet, he eternally knew who these darling objects were, for he had chosen them in Christ from the foundation of the world! Here is a picture of what has been represented as the gospel-plan. And as I shall take the liberty to recede from it, I beg leave to offer a few queries." pp. 3, 4.

The same year, (1807) the General Convention of Universalists appointed Messrs. Ballou, Kneeland and Turner a committee to prepare a new Hymn-Book. It was published in 1808; and, in the Preface, the committee state, as one of the reasons which moved the Convention, that the Collections hitherto in use, "containing many productions from those who possessed, not only limited views of "the great salvation, but ideas of the tenure of Atonement "contrary to the divine oracles, were not in that particular "altogether acceptable. The error," add they, "that "atonement was necessary to reconcile our heavenly

Digitized by Google

"Father to his offspring, in room of reconciling his unrec-
"onciled offspring to himself, is found in almost all the
"authors of divine hymns. It was a thing much desired
"by the Convention that the rising generation might learn
"to sing the praises of the Captain of our salvation with-
"out mixing the alloy of dishonor in the sacred song."

1809. We have before us only two sermons published this year, viz. Mr. Ballou's, at the Installation of Mr. Turner in Salem; and Mr. Turner's, at the Installation of Mr. Ballou in Portsmouth. Both of them are evidently Unitarian with respect to the Trinity and atonement; and to such as are acquainted with the forms in which Rellyanism had been held, several passages in both will appear to be aimed against that system as well as against the popular Calvinistic.

Perhaps we ought to mention, here, that a small periodical publication, called the Berean, advocating Universalism on Rellyan grounds, had been issued, at irregular intervals, from 1802. It ceased, with its eighth number, in 1810. We think it was written chiefly by members of Mr. Murray's congregation in Boston, and its circulation was probably confined, for the most part, to them and to Mr. Mitchell's society in New York, whose sentiments it represented. It is not distinguished either for ability or for perspicuity. The plan on which it argued, was worn out.

In June, 1811, Messrs. Jones of Gloucester, Ballou then of Portsmouth, Kneeland of Charlestown, and Turner of Salem, began a periodical of a different kind, entitled the Gospel Visitant. As they were the most active and influential of the Universalist ministry, their views may be taken as an example of those that prevailed in the Connection at the time. In their first number, we find an article devoted to the following question: "As the Scriptures "declare that Christ suffered, the just for the unjust, and "by his stripes we are healed; in what manner is an "application made to our salvation, of his sufferings, so as "to produce such an effect?" "Or, what bearing or rela-"tion has his death and sufferings with our salvation, so "that it may be said that 'with his stripes we are healed.'" After stating the Calvinistic, Hopkinsian, Arminian, and Rellyan hypotheses, the writer proceeds,—

Digitized by Google

"But notwithstanding the difference in the several systems of faith above mentioned, not only respecting the death and sufferings of Christ, but in many other respects, yet they all seem to have agreed in this one particular, that is, that the death and sufferings of Christ were inflicted as the *penalty*, or *substituted* as the *penalty*, of the divine *law;* and therefore his death was necessary to restore mankind to the *divine favor*, or 'to satisfy divine justice;' which presupposes a time when man was not in the favor of God, or when divine justice was dissatisfied!

"The objection against this idea lies in the immutability of God. See Mal. iii. 6. 'For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.' If God be unchangeable, the idea that he has become any more propitious, any more merciful, possessing any more love or clemency towards man, in consequence of the death and sufferings of Christ, (or from any other cause) or that mankind, or any part of them, are any more in the favor of God now, or ever will be, than what they eternally have been, ever since they were created in his own image, is wholly unfounded. How would it have been possible for God to have 'commended' his love towards us by the death of Christ, if his death were necessary to *produce* or *procure* the love of God to sinners? And if God loved sinners to that degree that he did not withhold his own Son, 'but delivered him up for us all,' it may be asked with propriety, how much better will God love those *sinners* after they shall have become *saints?* And if God have no love to sinners until after they are regenerated and born again, and if regeneration be produced by the 'special influences of the Spirit of God,' and if there be some that never will be thus regenerated, how was the death of Christ a 'commendation' of the love of God to them? 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' If we cannot conceive of any greater love than that which was manifested in the gift of the Son of God, then certainly his death was not necessary to 'purchase grace, holiness, and all spiritual blessings for his people,' or in other words, to 'restore' man to the 'divine favor,' because man was already in the *grace* or *favor* of God, (which is the same thing) and the gift of God in his Son Jesus Christ, is in evidence of favor. And as we have no scripture evidence that *divine justice* was ever *dissatisfied*, nor can we conceive how justice could be satisfied by the *sufferings* of *innocence*, as a *penalty* which was due only to the *guilty*, and as the holy scriptures do not impute sin to Christ, or any where consider him in the character of a sinner, so we cannot see how the sufferings of Christ could 'satisfy divine justice.'

Digitized by Google

"But perhaps the reader begins to grow impatient for a positive answer to the question. Then observe, The gift of God in Christ Jesus, and the persevering works of his ministry, even to the laying down of his life, were necessary to COMMEND THE LOVE OF GOD TO SINNERS; and the sufferings and death of Christ were *consequent* upon his being sent 'in the likeness of sinful flesh,' and his coming into a sinful world. 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends:' 'But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet *sinners*, Christ died for us.' 'For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the *ungodly*.'

"Having given this answer, it will now be incumbent on us to show how it may be said that Christ suffered the just *for* the unjust, or died *for* us, the ungodly, unless he suffered a *penalty* justly due to us *for* our transgressions. And, to be sure, if there be no way in which one person may be said to suffer for another, unless he suffer in the character of a criminal, or as a surety, or in some sense or other suffer a punishment which is justly due to the person for whom he suffers, we may meet with some difficulty in explaining this subject; but if it may be said of a man with propriety, that he suffers *for* another, or *for* others, although he does not suffer in the character or in the sense above mentioned, then we shall meet with no difficulty in reconciling all the scripture testimony upon this subject with the answer above given; that is, that all the sufferings, and even the death of Christ, in the light of suffering, was consequent upon his coming into a sinful world; and it pleased the Father to send him into the world to *commend* or *manifest* his love to the human race. 'For God so *loved* the *world*, that he sent his only begotten Son,' &c.

"It will require but litttle attention to discover that one man may with propriety be said to suffer for others, although, to gain some glorious object, he voluntarily put himself into the place of suffering. This is always the case when one man freely offers himself, or engages in a service, in the behalf of others, that occasions him painful labors, or brings on himself the envy and reproach of an ungrateful public. As, for an example: Did not the ILLUSTRIOUS WASHINGTON, the *political saviour* of his country, voluntarily suffer, and expose himself to every hazard and danger *for* America? And will any body pretend that he suffered as a *criminal*, or that he suffered a *penalty* justly due to others? No! Although he was 'numbered with the transgressors,' or with the rebellious, by those who were inimical to the *independence* or *political salvation* which he achieved, yet his name will ever be dear to every true American. Yes, and it may be said, in a certain sense, 'he suffered the just for the unjust;'

Digitized by Google

for he suffered as much for those of his countrymen who at heart were inimical to him, and secretly strove to thwart all his plans, being citizens of the United States, as he did for those who were workers together with him in the glorious cause; and the independence of the United States was finally gained as much for those who were inimical to American liberty, being citizens, as it was for himself. All this suffering was for us, the sons of freedom and liberty, for his country, and in many respects for his *enemies!* And if there had been a *traitor*, like *Arnold*, or if there had been a *Judas* in his own family, it is possible he might have been massacred or suffered an ignominious death, as the leader of rebellion! But even had this also been the case, it might have been truly said that he suffered and died for us; or if he had been slain in the field of battle, his name would have been enrolled with WARREN, MONTGOMERY, and other American Heroes who bled for us. All this, so far as it goes, is directly in point.

"Once more. The following similitude, coming nearer to the case under consideration, will throw further light upon the subject. A father has a numerous family of children, all of whom, except their elder brother, have revolted from him, and have eaten of forbidden and poisonous fruit, which has so deranged the state of their minds that they have lost the true knowledge of their father, have formed very erroneous ideas of his character, have become alienated from his happy life through ignorance, not knowing their father's love and affection towards them, and are seeking happiness in the indulgence of their carnal appetites and passions. The father remains the same, and possesses every parental tie and feeling towards his children, notwithstanding their false notions respecting their father's character. He foresaw all the consequences of their disobedience, even before they revolted from him, and as they were not irreparable, he, for wise purposes, suffered them to revolt; knowing that he had a sure antidote within himself for this poisonous food, and by delivering them from their lapsed state, he should be able to make such displays of his love and goodness towards his children as would ever after establish them in a just and permanent faith respecting his character, so that they never would again revolt from his precepts and government. All this he makes known to his only begotten son, (who had not gone astray) and after explaining to him the dangers and the hardships of the undertaking, constituted him his sole agent to communicate the *bread of life* to his lapsed brethren; the *bread of life* being the only antidote to the *knowledge of good and evil*, the poisonous fruit of which, through disobedience, they had eaten. The *first-born* voluntarily undertakes the arduous work of doing his father's will. He went, and after

Digitized by Google

passing through many sorrows, enduring many scenes of suffering, which were the fruits of depraved minds, he came off victorious, and brought home his wandering brethren, as trophies of his victory, to his father's house.

"In all this it is very easy to discover the nature of the sufferings of the first-born, or what would be a proper application to be made of them in this case. Did he receive stripes? they were in consequence of the ignorance, prejudices, malice and envy of his guilty brethren. And although they were healed *directly* by the *bread of life*, yet they were healed, *indirectly*, by, or through those *stripes*.

"Is not the American Independence often spoken of as costing much *blood*? —as being achieved by the *blood* of our fathers and brethren; meaning the blood of the slain and wounded in the field of battle? But who ever supposed that the blood of our bravest men, when spilt, had any more efficacy than water spilt on the ground? None! Nor did even the unparalleled sufferings of the American army, although they were almost beyond description, have any more effect, in an abstract point of view, towards gaining our independence; for every one knows that every officer and soldier that fell, instead of strengthening, weakened the American forces; and so with the other sufferings. Yet those sufferings were immediately connected with that power, which, under God, performed the glorious deed.

"So in the other similitude: It was the *bread of life*, which was communicated through the agency of the first-born, and not his sufferings, that effected the deliverance of his brethren. The bread of life restored them from all the evil effects of the poisonous fruit. His sufferings, abstractedly considered, did them no good; neither ought we to view them as a *penalty* inflicted by the father in consequence of the disobedience of his other children; but his sufferings all come from a different source; that is, from the envy and ingratitude of his guilty brethren. Yet his sufferings were immediately connected with, and held a conspicuous place, in the arduous work.

"By recurring to the scriptures, it will be clearly seen that the above similitudes are directly to the point in question.

"Christ is the 'first-born of every creature,' the 'head of every man,' the 'only begotten of the father,' who went not astray. He came to do the will of HIM that sent him, to *seek* and to *save* that which was lost. He is the 'bread of God' which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world.' But the *bread* which he gives he declares to be his *flesh*, and his '*blood* is drink indeed.' Yet Christ himself adds, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth: the *flesh* profiteth nothing: the *words* that I speak

Digitized by Google

unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.' Hence it is evident that it is that divine instruction which proceeded from the lips of Jesus, and not his death, which alone is able to quicken into life a soul that is dead in trespasses and sins. How is it conceivable that the literal flesh or blood of Jesus should have any more efficacy to put away sin, than the flesh or blood of the sacrifices under the law? And the apostle saith, 'It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin.'" . . . .

"It is not our present design to attempt an elucidation of God's holy and gracious covenant, but if our present views of the subject are correct, then it is evident that the death and sufferings of Christ, in themselves considered, have all that relation or connection with our salvation, according to the magnitude of the object, as the *fatigue* and *sweat* of a man who voluntarily labors in the field to procure bread for his children, have with the *life* and *health* of his children. In the *first* place, the life of his children is the gift of God: *Secondly*, that life is prolonged, and rendered comfortable and happy by the means of the labor in the field: *Thirdly*, fatigue and sweat are the natural effects of labor. Thus God said to Adam, 'In the *sweat* of thy face, shalt thou eat bread;' meaning that he should be obliged to till the ground to procure that necessary article. So in the other case; our *existence* is the gift of God. *Secondly*, that existence is rendered happy by the grace of God given us in him who is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption; and to bring us to the knowledge of this grace was Christ's errand into the world. *Thirdly*, his sufferings and death were the natural consequences, considering the state that mankind were in, of his coming into the world on such an errand. Hence it may be said that we are healed by his stripes in the same sense that Adam ate bread *in*, or by the sweat of his face.

"There is another circumstance respecting the death of Christ which ought not to pass unnoticed; that is, as it respects the magnitude of his sufferings. This is a subject upon which but very little has appeared in print. It has been generally understood, however, by those who consider the violation of the obligations of the *creature* to love and obey God, infinitely criminal, that the holy and righteous law of God incurred an infinite penalty, and of course demanded an infinite punishment, or required an infinite sacrifice as a substitute, none of which could be abated; hence it has been believed that the sufferings of Christ were equal in magnitude to the infinite, or *endless* misery of all those who will finally be saved by the mercies of that all-sufficient sacrifice. It is no more than reasonable to suppose that the advocates of this system have ever discovered some difficulty on this subject; hence

Digitized by Google

there seems to have been a studied reserve as to expressing it in plain and positive terms. For but very few have ever been willing to state, in so many words, that God did absolutely die! or even suffer! and, short of this idea, it has been difficult to see how there could have been an infinite sacrifice, or an infinite suffering in the death of Christ; for if Deity himself did not suffer, then the suffering was no more than human; and even if all human nature suffered in him, the suffering being short, was very far from being *infinite*. This point, therefore, has rather been attempted to be supported by implication and allusions, than by any positive proof. We frequently meet with 'Our dying God,' 'Our bleeding God,' 'Maker died,' &c. in hymns composed for public devotion, alluding to the death of Christ, but in connection with such other words, that nothing short of the Deity could be meant. This undoubtedly has been supposed to be necessary in order to keep up the idea of an infinite sacrifice; as it is very evident that the sufferings of Christ were but very short, as to time. But should we be disposed to admit the possibility of the incomprehensible idea of an *infinite suffering* in a *few hours!* it may be asked what is gained by it? We cannot conceive of a greater suffering than *infinite;* and if Christ endured such a scene of suffering, has there been any less suffering in the system of God in consequence of the sufferings of Christ? Is it not most reasonable to suppose that the same being who could look with infinite complacency on the sufferings of Christ, admitting them to be equal to what the *endless misery* of all the saved of the Lord would have been, had it not been for those sufferings, could have looked with equal complacency on the endless misery of all mankind? What glory will it reflect on the Divine character to say that a part, or even all of mankind, are emancipated from endless misery by an adequate suffering in him 'who knew no sin?' And if the justice of God could accept of a suffering in any degree less than the endless misery of all those which strict justice requires, even on the ground of a *penalty*, is it necessary to suppose that the sufferings of Christ were any greater than what the sufferings of any other man, in the same circumstances would have been? For if justice could accept of a less suffering than infinite, why must it have had a greater suffering than what Christ as a man, apparently suffered."—*Gospel Visitant, vol. i. pp* 37–45.

This article has already extended to such a length, that we are obliged to stop short in our attempt to follow the publications onward, year by year. The documents and extracts, now presented, are sufficient to show what posi-

Digitized by Google

tion the Universalists held, as to the points under review, during the period we have passed over; and it may be enough to add, that the tide of sentiment, in these respects, has never since turned back, in our Connection. From 1816, when the writer of this became a member of the General Convention, the state of opinion among us lies tolerably distinct in his own memory. At that time, it was supposed that the only Trinitarians, in our ministry, were Mr. Dean of Boston, and Mr. Mitchell of New York; the latter of whom, though a highly respected preacher of Universalism, was never in formal fellowship with our body, as his attachments to Mr. Murray's peculiarities were so strong as to prevent him from uniting with the Denomination. Besides the two congregations under their care, there were some old Universalists, scattered through the country, who retained more or less of the Rellyan notions. Of those, however, with whom we became acquainted, not more than a dozen held them in their original form; and the whole tenor of preaching and argument, which we heard from our ministers, ran in the contrary direction. From the year, 1819, when the Universalist Magazine, the predecessor of the Trumpet, began to be published in Boston, the views of our Denomination on the subject, are too manifest to need any other exposition than a reference to the pages of that journal.

It may be well to observe that, at this last date, another and far more learned body of divines had taken the lead in defending the simple unity of God and the rational doctrine of atonement. These topics had become their appropriate charge; and it is well-known with what eminent ability and success they have executed the trust. Perhaps the natural consequence has been, that the Universalists felt somewhat relieved from the call to labor on the secondary points, now in so able hands, and that they devoted themselves with more undivided attention to the distinguishing tenet of their profession. We are inclined to think that, for some cause, they have never since taken so active a part, certainly not so forward a part, as before, in the controversy with Trinitarianism and Vicarious atonement. Meanwhile, their position with respect to these points, has been perfectly open and decided, and tolerably well known. As long ago as 1830, the "Chris-

Digitized by Google

tian Examiner," in reviewing the Histories of Universalism, mentioned our "almost unanimous rejection of the "Trinity," and confirmed the fact by quoting the testimony of our preachers in different parts of the country. In 1833, the "Quarterly Christian Spectator," in a labored article on Universalism, said, "The reader cannot but an- "ticipate what Universalists teach respecting the *person* "and *office* of Christ. They regard the Saviour as a crea- "ted and dependent being; and generally they represent "him as having had no existence before he was manifested "in the flesh, [which, by the way is too strongly stated.] "In other words, so far as this point is concerned, they "are generally Unitarians of the lowest rank. The "work of Christ, the office which he sustains as a Saviour, "they regard as being simply the work of reconciling men "to God. 'Let it be understood,' say they, 'that it is man "who receives the atonement, who stands in need of re- "conciliation, who being dissatisfied, needs satisfaction,'" &c. &c.

There is one argument which Universalists have always laid great stress upon, which a hasty observer might perhaps mistake for some form of Calvinism or Rellyanism. They regard the scriptural fact that Christ "tasted death for every man," that he "gave himself a ransom for all," as a signal proof of the universality embraced in his mission and work of salvation: "God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth; for, there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who *gave himself a ransom for all.*" In this light, they frequently urge the consideration. We discover neither any defect in the argument, nor any necessary connection of it with the old doctrine of Vicarious sufferings, though we can readily see how it may be associated, in the popular mind, with that hypothesis. It must be added, that Universalists have generally given a very prominent place, in their preaching and writings, to the death of Christ, as a most affecting commendation of God's love to mankind. In doing this, however, they but follow the example of the New Testament. Were we to express our own personal sentiments on the subject, we should say that the sufferings and death of our Saviour are a fountain of moral power which has not been fathomed,

Digitized by Google

and of which we have sometimes thought that the Liberal sects, so called, do not sufficiently avail themselves. It would be a sad oversight, in our ministry, to pass by the importance which the inspired teachers habitually ascribe to the sacrifice of the cross, through fear of countenancing the subsequent perversions of the church. Explain it on what theory we will, the sorrows of the Son of God have an almighty influence to sanctify the heart of the believer; and it is only through this medium that his gospel can work with its proper energy. At the same time, there is no need of presenting the subject in such a way as to call up the arbitrary views and absurdities of the old creeds. They are really as foreign to the language and spirit of the New Testament, as they are injurious to the effect which the scriptural representation exerts.

The large quotations we have given from contemporary publications, and the facts we have stated, partly on our own recollection, and partly on the testimony of others, cannot fail to show what position was taken, at an early period, by the Universalists of this country, in respect to the Trinity and Atonement. We do not claim for them much scientific research on the subjects, nor would we be understood that their sentiments on these points were, for some time, free from relics of their former notions. But the part they acted, both in public and in private, and the ground they have held for more than forty years, are unquestionably important in accounting for the prevalence which Liberal doctrines have gained in the community.

H. B. 2d.

Art. XXIX.

Nicodemus.

We have, at times, felt a degree of sorrow that a full account of Nicodemus had not been left by some of his contemporaries, who were well enough acquainted with his life and fortunes to do us that service. The few notices that

Digitized by Google

are given of him, in the New Testament, seem to indicate a man of amiable character, of good sense, of some æsthetical culture, and of prudent, judicious moderation; one, too, who was at heart strongly disposed to the right, though he lacked resolution to follow it. He has always been rather a favorite with us, notwithstanding his weakness. In our desire for a more thorough acquaintance with the biography of such a man, it has occurred to us, that, if we bring together the several hints concerning him, that are scattered through the Gospel of St. John, and connect them with the circumstances and state of things in which he lived, we shall be able, with a little knowledge of the general laws of human nature, to get a pretty clear insight into the workings of his mind, and to appreciate the part he acted. Our materials are indeed rather scanty; but we have sometimes found a few casual notices avail more than a complete description. They may prove to be so apt, so significant, they may strike so directly at the heart of the matter, as to lay open the whole of one's character to view, just as a few touches of a master's pencil will often bring out a whole picture more distinctly to the eye, than if the drawing were all filled up. Let us try our hand at reproducing Nicodemus on the canvass.

It appears that he enjoyed a respectable rank in social life; he was one of the rulers of the Jews. We learn, too, that he belonged, where we might expect to find him, with the Pharisees, the most popular and best reputed sect of his time and country. It seems doubtful to us whether he had any special affinities with them, of a native kind. We think he had not, and that he gravitated towards them only by the force of certain factitious attractions, which we will try to explain. There is a delicate taste for what is currently accepted as elegance, a sympathy with the approved standard of refinement, a devout ambition to move in respectable circles, which repels one from a connection with human nature in its unpatented forms, and which always tends upward towards the select heaven of gentility, even in its religious aspirations. It would have been a sad thing for such a man as Nicodemus, if true religion in his day had appeared only down among the lower classes of unpolished, inartifical men; especially, if he had been required to cast his lot with them, for good

Digitized by Google

or evil report, in order to be a disciple. We have sometimes amused ourselves with imagining him obliged, for conscience' sake, to become one among a company of Galilean fishermen and publicans of the most primitive kind, with the upper world of respectability in plain sight above him, the mean while! obliged to forego his intimacy with Annas and Caiaphas and their associates, and to become a brother to Peter and John and James, and to Lazarus and his sisters! But then the truth is, he could not have done it; and perhaps the thought itself, though indulged only in fancy, has too great a spice of wanton mischief in it to be commendable. If we love him, we shall not seriously wish that he were put to so fruitless an attempt. It is true, that time has quite changed the relations of those old Galilean peasants, and revealed a halo of glory around them, which throws all their contemporaries into the shade; so that, if Nicodemus were living now, he would be likely to sympathize very freely with them; we mean, with their posthumous reputation. Alas, that this could not have been foreseen in his day! though indeed, if it had been, we may still doubt whether it would have made any material difference in his case. For respectability itself, at a reversion of several centuries, is far too distant to meet the necessities of such a mind,—

"———— mit den Todten
Hab' ich mich niemals gern befangen."

His cherished tendencies, we are inclined to think, might have carried him over, at last, to the choicer, aristocratic sect of the Sadducees, were it not for two things. The dignified reserve and somewhat forbidding manners of this party were too obviously uncongenial with his milder social temper; and then he must also have felt, even if he did not consciously deliberate on the matter, that their Olympian-like seclusion would rather debar him from a free access to the multitude, in whose presence only he could realize the pleasurable contrast, and receive, in its freshness, the incense of popular respect. Like the manna, that angels' food of old, it needs to be gathered fresh every day. Plainly, there were grave objections to the

Digitized by Google

social position of the Sadducees. That of the Pharisees was far more eligible for him. They maintained, from their convenient elevation, a constant intercourse with the popular mass, as the common guardians and instructers. Never was there a religious body in the world that exercised a wider influence among the people, or that was held in profounder veneration. If we consider, we shall see there can be no question *where* such a man as Nicodemus would naturally belong, nor can we doubt *whither* he would gravitate, should any disturbing forces happen occasionally to unsettle his position.

It will be instructive, now, to set the elements of his character at work, and to see how they operate in contact with the ever-present influences and categories of social life. If we follow out the course of his experience, it will exemplify the laws that govern our nature in similar conditions. One thing must have been very gratifying to him. We infer, from a notice in the seventh chapter of St. John's Gospel, that he had a place among the seventy-two elders and chief-priests who composed the great council, or Sanhedrin, of the nation. He sat with them in judgement on all the important questions of religious and civil interest, that agitated the community. Of course, the people looked up to him as one of their chief dignitaries. He was "a master of Israel;" and, according to the custom of the Jews, he was addressed by the respectful title of "Rabbi" wherever he went. It was by no means necessary that he should make an ostentatious parade of these distinctions; his good taste, his gentle and rather timid nature, would save him from coarse displays of such a kind. But we may easily conceive how agreeable to him must have been the whole contexture of his relations in society.

All this, when once attained, he enjoyed at a very cheap rate. He had only to remain a Pharisee, as he had hitherto been; that is, to appear, speak and act as the Pharisees did, to observe their customs, to advocate their general policy, or to excuse it, as the case might be, and, in one word, to be of the same mind with them; all of which, by the way, was in itself highly reputable, belonging to the class of standard accomplishments.

This was all that his honors and social elevation cost

Digitized by Google

him, at least in the eyes of the world. We indeed, who see more fully into the case, know that he had also to compromise his conscience. That one fact changes the whole character of the affair. In himself, he secretly felt that the teachings of Christ were God's truth, while he was keeping up, before men, the pretence of being a regular Parisee. He could not suppress his conviction, on the one hand; but, on the other, he could not renounce his profession, lest the arbiters of his fate should withdraw their countenance, and he should lose his position in society. The doctrines which he supported and adorned by his influential standing and honorable name, and which in turn repaid him with office and general respect, were not the doctrines that he really believed. When he went into the solemn convocations of the Jews, and took his part in the services of the synagogue, he knew that his true place was not there. When he joined, as he was obliged to do, in the measures and policy of the Pharisees, he was conscious of wrong, at least of moral impropriety. In his own heart he condemned their cause; but, for the sake of popular favor, he submitted to all, called it very good, a thing that ought to be maintained. He had to look as if he approved the whole, and to recommend it to others, by word and by example, or else he knew he should betray himself.

Yet, even in this, let us not judge him too severely. It seems improbable that he meant deliberately and wilfully to violate his sense of right. His disposition would lead him rather to compromise, to work by halves, to find out ways by which he might avoid committing himself against the cause of Christ, and even aid it on proper occasions, while he still preserved his influence on the popular side. The accommodating kind of ethics, prevalent in his day as well as in our own, would furnish him with the usual justifications to sophisticate his understanding, though they would never satisfy his conscience. Indeed, if we were to go to the root of the evil, we should find it lying much farther back, than in any questions of casuistry. The germ of all his errors was only a very common fault, one that is compatible with many virtues, and still more with many engaging qualities. He sought human favor and respect as the great indispensable good of life, as some-

Digitized by Google

thing divine. With this principle of action, it was impossible that he should be an honest man, whenever the path of duty should lie out of the limits of worldly honor and respectability, as it so often does. We are by no means so unreasonable as to speak disparagingly of these objects, when they are not pursued as an end, when they come of themselves, in the natural course of things, as the consequence of worth, or of virtuous enterprise. But when they are sought at the expense of any swerving from the line of rectitude, they are sure to prove a snare and a curse. Of all miserable creatures in this world, there is none to be pitied more than he whose conscience admonishes him, day by day, that he dares not show himself in his real colors, that he is acting a double part in the sight of heaven, untrue to himself, a slave to the eyes of others, and, in plain language, a hypocrite. Excuse the matter, explain it, as he may, *there* lies the wearisome burden on his heart. Who would endure the ever-present consciousness, that himself was a dishonest pretender, living on false appearances! The world may approve and do homage, in its ignorance of his real character; but he cannot approve himself. Did he only know, beforehand, what uneasiness of soul, what self-reproach, what perpetual anxiety, must attend every species of hypocrisy, he could not hesitate a moment to sacrifice all that life has to bestow, rather than to undertake the perilous game.

The list of his trials does not end here. Now, human nature is so constituted that men cannot help feeling some desire for what they really believe to be the truth, though they side against it in public. Then comes the conflict, in their souls, between the cause which their hearts secretly espouse, and their time-serving policy. How long must Nicodemus have borne this internal strife, before he could bring his mind to the determination to seek Jesus "by night." How does it look for so high-spirited a man, one so honored, to shun the open light of day, and to plan stolen visits in darkness! The truth was, he could no longer endure the part he himself was acting in apparent opposition to his own sentiments. See Jesus he must, and hear him converse; he has kept away as long as he could, and now he must go. But how can he give up his honored standing in the world, and come down

Digitized by Google

from the upper circles in which he has hitherto moved? We are well enough acquainted with the disposition of the man to know that he cannot part with these, at all events. As it was natural that he should do, in such a crisis, he steals away clandestinely, under the shade of night, afraid of the veriest slave he might meet, lest his visit should become known, and he be exposed,—himself the most fearful slave of all.

It does not appear, however, that Nicodemus was exposed, we mean at this time. It would seem that he fortunately got through with this visit to Jesus without detection. But there was another crisis awaiting him, that he probably had never anticipated. His difficulties were thickening around him, as is generally the case with such as try to walk in his crooked path. When people have once sacrificed their conscience for the sake of popular favor, the devil seems to delight in contriving occasions to vex and torment them, one would think in order to see how they will act. They soon find that they cannot go with the current, and hold their assumed position, without joining in certain measures of abuse or ill-treatment of the very cause which they secretly revere in their hearts. If we look around in the word, we shall often see men reduced to this most painful dilemma. Their souls revolt at the thought of taking an active part in direct hostility to what they really believe the truth; they never meant to go farther at the utmost than simply to stand aloof from all apparent connection with the right side; they would be incapable of such consummate wickedness as to abuse it in any positive manner. But the time comes when they must go headlong into this aggravated guilt; for if they refuse, they will lose all they have been seeking at so much expense. What shall they do? It has been said that the Christian life is a cross-bearing way. However this way be, it is certain that *their* way is such. With a patience worthy of a better cause, they take up their cross, and stagger forwards, or suffer themselves to be driven on, reluctantly, into the commission of any abuse their masters choose. It will not do for the yoked slaves to hold back, then. Such was the trial that awaited Nicodemus. We are told that the council of rulers and chief-priests, of which he was a member, sent officers to take Jesus, that they might

Digitized by Google

put him to death. What a piece of work for Nicodemus to be engaged in, who was himself secretly a Christian! It does not appear, in the account, that he made an effort, or said a word, to prevent the measure. From what we have seen of the man, we know that he would not dare to interpose. He probably sat there in silence, his heart beating faint with uncertainty how the matter would turn. If Jesus should be arrested, he knew full well that the illustrious prisoner, the "teacher come from God," would be brought in there before the council, and that he should be obliged to sit in judgment upon him, and to join in his condemnation. How dreadful an hour that must have been to Nicodemus, while the officers were gone on their search, and the result was still unknown within the hall! At length the officers returned. Oh, thank God! Jesus was not with them; they had not apprehended him. They made their report,—that they had seen him, and listened to his discourse; and, added they, in tones that startled the council, "Never man spake like this man!" It is remarkable, how the undaunted look, and fearless voice, even of one brave man, will call forth a momentary glow of courage in the most timid. The answer of these honest, plain-spoken officers emboldened the faint-hearted Nicodemus himself; and this great man, this ruler of the Jews, this honorable member of the Sanhedrin, now gathered courage to speak, in this favorable turn of affairs, and to venture the following very reasonable appeal to the council, "Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" Certainly, quite an impartial demurrer! there seemed no danger in reminding them of so much. He would not go so far as to plead the cause of Christ; he only asked, "Doth our law judge *any* man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" But alas! in saying this, he made the long-feared disclosure of his real feelings. The sharp-eared Pharisees caught the spirit of his words, and turned upon him with the exclamation, "Art thou also of Galilee?" disposed, are you, to side with Jesus, and to favor his escape? Had a clap of thunder broken over his head, he could not have been more dismayed, than at this.

One cannot but pity Nicodemus, unworthy as he was. He had sacrificed his conscience; he had lived in fear of

Digitized by Google

betraying himself; he had trained his looks, his speech and his actions, to conceal his real sentiments; he had been a slave to the popular leaders; and he had lost his object, after all. Here he stood, at length, unmasked. He had been surprised by his nobler feelings, in a moment of inadvertency, to let the veil fall from before his heart, and the Pharisees saw through him. He could expect no more favor from them; and he had neither courage nor strength of principle to be a Christian. From this time onwards we hear nothing of the honorable Nicodemus, except that he assisted in burying the body of Jesus, after it was taken from the cross.

The truth is, no man is capable of sufficient cunning, foresight and management, to play through the part he undertook, without betraying himself sooner or later. A thousand circumstances, that he cannot anticipate and provide for, are daily occurring to expose him. In the language of holy Writ, "The heavens shall reveal his iniquity, and the earth shall rise up against him." There is not an element in nature, but is working to bring him forth into light. Every word he utters, every look that escapes him, enters into the chain of testimony that is forming in secret to entangle him. If there were nothing to fear from without, the internal forces of his moral nature cannot always be suppressed. His heart will prove too strong for all his prudence. H. B. 2d.

Art. XXX.

My Sleeping Children.

Ye sleep, my children! on your soft blue eyes —
Those eyes that once, like Summer-sunlight glancing,
From morn till eve with joy seemed ever dancing —
A mournful slumber lies!

Digitized by Google

Ye sleep! but I—I wake to watch your rest!
Yet not as erst, when, round your temples wreathing,
The light locks stirred, at every gentle breathing
From your full, quiet breast!

No more my fingers on my lips I lay,
Lest some rude sound, some sudden footstep—jarring
Your little couch, and the hushed stillness marring—
Should chase your sleep away!

Ah, no! the winds go moaning o'er your heads,
And the sweet dryads of the valley, winging
In airy circles, wild, shrill strains are singing,
Above your grassy beds.

But ye wake not! They disturb not now!
And a vain gush of childlike grief comes o'er me,
As the dread memory sudden sweeps before me
That *death* is on your brow!

O, precious ones, that seemed too fair to die!
My soft-eyed Mary — child of seraph-sweetness —
Bright vision, vanished with a shadow's fleetness —
Why hast thou left me? Why!

Wert weary, gentle dove, of this cold world?
And didst thou long to rest thy little pinions
Far in those bright and beautiful dominions,
Where they at last are furled?

Wert homesick, darling? *Could* thy little heart
Yearn for a love more tender than we bore thee,
Yearn for a watch more fond and faithful o'er thee,
That thou shouldst hence depart?

That thou shouldst hence and leave me here behind,
To fold thy little robes in silent anguish;
To dry my tears, then weep again; to languish
For what I cannot find?

Had my low cradle-song no longer charms —
That cradle-song, whose soft and plaintive numbers
Lull'd thee each evening to thy gentle slumbers—
To keep thee in my arms?

And thou, my boy! my beautiful! my own!
Twin-cherub of the one who stands beside me,
Grieving that we within the earth should hide thee,
And leave thee all alone!

Digitized by Google

Grieving that thou canst play with him no more!
That, though his tears upon thy grave are falling,
Thy voice replies not to his mournful calling,—
Unheeded ne'er before!

Did the sweet cup of life already cloy,
That from thy lips, ere scarcely it was tasted—
Ere from its brim one sparkling gleam was wasted,
Thou laidst it down, my boy?

Nay, wherefore question?—To my pleadings vain,
No voice to still my spirit's restless yearning,—
No sweet reply to soothe my heart's deep burning,
Comes from your graves again!

Ye were! ye are not! Thus earth's bloom decays!—
I watch the flowers 'neath Autumn's footsteps dying,
Yet know the Spring-breath, o'er the vallies sighing,
Each from its tomb will raise.

But ye! O, ye!—Though soft the vernal rain,
The sweet Spring-showers—stern Winter's chains dissolving—
May round you fall—earth's teeming life evolving,—
Ye will not bloom again!

Though by the streams and all the meadows o'er,
'Mid woods and dells, the South's gay clarion ringing,
May peal till life is everywhere upspringing,
Ye—ye will wake no more!

Nay, ye *will* wake!—Not here! not here! but There!
In Heaven!—O, there, ye bloom e'en now!—where never
Falls the chill blight, and each sweet flower forever
Lives beautiful and fair!

There shall I find you—stainless, pure and bright,
As the pure seraph-eyes, whose myriad numbers
Are watching now above your peaceful slumbers
From the far zenith's height!

There shall I clasp you to my heart once more,
And feel your cheeks mine own, with rapture, pressing,
Till all my being thrills with your caressing,
And all its pain is o'er!

Dear ones! sleep on! A low, mysterious tone,
Solemn, yet sweet, my spirit's ear is filling,
Each wilder grief within my bosom stilling,
And hushing sorrow's moan!

Digitized by Google

It tells me, that, no shadow on your brow,
Far from the clouds that closely round me gather,
Clasped in the bosom of the Good All-Father,
Ye're blest and happy now!

Aye! blest and happy! never more shall tears
Dim those sweet eyes! — temptation ne'er shall round you
Wind its dark evils, nor guilt, nor falsehood wound you,
Through all your endless years!

Farewell, awhile! Ye were my heart's delight!
Ye were sweet stars, my spirit's clouds dissolving,
Round which my heart was evermore revolving,
Like some fond satellite!

Ah! well I loved you! but I yield you up,
Without one murmur, at my Father's calling!
With childlike trust, though fast my tears are falling,
I drink the bitter cup!

I drink; for He whom angels did sustain
When the dread hour of mortal anguish met him,
When friends forgot and deadly foes beset him,
Stands by to soothe my pain!

I drink; for Thou, O God! preparedst the draught
Which to my lips Thy Father-hand is pressing!
I know, 'neath ills oft lurks the deepest blessing!
Father! the cup is quaffed!

'Tis quaffed! and now, O Father! I restore
The little children Thou in mercy sent me!
Sweet blessings were they, for a season lent me!
Take back Thine own, once more!

Yet, O forget not, Lord! thy child is weak!
The dregs are bitter which my lips are draining;
And my faint heart hath need of Thy sustaining!
Father! thy child is weak!

Yet, take Thine own! Their souls are innocent!
Their little lives were beautiful and blameless!
I bring them back to Thee, pure, white and stainless,
E'en as when they were lent!

Keep them, and make them each a shining gem
'Mid the bright things which fill the bowers of Heaven,
'Till mine own spirit soars — earth's fetters riven —
HOME! HOME! *to Thee and them!*

C. M. S.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXXI.

The Idea of God and the Truths of Christianity.

There are two roads to a satisfactory faith in Christianity, — cultivation of the higher feelings, and education of the mind. Men belong in different classes, and arrive at truth in different ways, according as spiritual sympathies or a critical understanding gives the tone or temper to their nature. Some become conscious of faith by what is called *intuition*, — the quick and uncomprehended response of their souls to a given doctrine or principle; others are led to faith by the gradual perception of its logical legitimacy. A weight may be attracted and held up by a loadstone, or it can be suspended on a hook; and we may say that one class of minds are brought in contact with truth in a manner analogous to the first of these methods, another class in a manner analogous to the last. In the souls of one class, truth exists rather as a deep sympathy, they feel it more warmly and utter it with greater force: in the minds of another class, it dwells rather as a clear idea; having attained it by reflection, they see it more distinctly, and present it more methodically to others.

What is stated thus as a general principle is peculiarly applicable to the evidences of Christianity. The *heart* may become so pure and all the moral affections so refined, that Christian principles shall be acknowledged intuitively to be the natural laws of the soul, and the character of Christ shall be accepted spontaneously as the model of our nature; and, on the other hand, the *intellect* may be so trained and applied, that the proofs for the truth and claims of Christianity will exercise an overwhelming force. To minds of a certain order, the natural door to Christian faith is through the head; Christianity, as a whole, is set before them as a problem for solution, and their reason is determined towards assent or skepticism by the historical or philosophical arguments which can be ad-

Digitized by Google

duced in its behalf. And there are other minds, that never think to inquire into the scientific claims of the Gospel as a system, who yet rely with undisturbed assurance on the satisfaction and peace which faithfulness to Christian laws infuses into the soul. The former examine Christianity, and find that all the conditions of belief are fulfilled in the evidences which may be presented, and therefore they cannot doubt; the latter are not prompted to examine, and never doubt, because they naturally believe.

We may assume, I think, that among the disciples of the Saviour, John was a type of the last named order of natures, and Thomas of the first. In the language of Jesus, too, we find allusions to this difference in the structure of men's souls. To one class of Jews he said, "ye believe not *because* ye are not of my sheep;" their natures had seemingly no affinities with his doctrines and demands; while he affirmed the same principle in a positive form in the passage, "all that *are of the truth* hear my voice." Upon another class he urged the propriety of believing "for the very works' sake," because the *argument* for his supernatural mission was too strong to be resisted. And in all ages of the church has this distinction been apparent. The faith of Fenelon, and the faith of Chillingworth, when analysed, reveal the power of different methods to induce conviction. Refined sentiment, through the spiritual insight which it quickens, and the attractions which it brings into play, and rigorous logic, by the power of persuasion which it may exert upon the reason, will equally generate a healthy confidence in the truth of the great features of the Gospel. The soul may be lifted into an instinctive assurance; the mind may be coerced into a lagging assent.

The proofs of Christianity which may be brought to satisfy reason are of two kinds. We may present the historical argument which establishes the facts of the Gospel narratives, or we may urge the harmony which the truths of Christianity manifest with the religion of nature, and trace the probabilities that follow from an adequate idea of God.

Of the two departments of evidence for the Divine authority of the Gospel, the first or practical argument is undoubtedly the highest, and induces in sensitive and cul-

Digitized by Google

tivated hearts the most secure and cheerful faith. It cannot be questioned, either, that the historical evidences may be so arrayed that a skeptical mind cannot evade, and must acknowledge, their strength. It is the design of this article, however, to consider particularly the last division of the logical defences of Christianity, — to show by a rapid survey, and such suggestions as our restricted limits will enable us to present, how naturally the principles of the New Testament theology evolve themselves from the conception which we are obliged to form of God. Such an argument should be often urged in this day, we believe, since it is calculated to meet the state of mind of many in our time who give little attention to the historical proofs of Christianity, and who are afflicted with a lurking skepticism.

When we talk with intelligent persons on religious topics, such as piety, providence, prayer, a future life, &c., we are often met by the remark, — "I believe in a Supreme Being, an overruling agency, but farther than that I am very ignorant, it is all uncertain and dark." This is either the polite way in which many persons intimate their skepticism to clergymen, or the natural mode in which it unconsciously breaks out. Every minister knows that there is a large class of men, who will readily confess, when their intimate confidence is secured, that they have no staunch, firm faith in the teachings of the Gospel, that they cannot pretend to that serene conviction which induces general equanimity of soul. And yet they are very earnest in asserting unwavering belief in God. They are perfectly confident of His existence, but their creed contains no other article of faith, and here their confession ends.

Now this is the state of mind for which there is the least possible excuse. Setting aside the historical and practical evidences of the Gospel, a Christian can easily show the folly of this narrow, barren Deism which contents itself with a confession of the existence of a Deity, and declares its ignorance of all other elements of religion. If a man does not believe more, if his religious faith does not extend a good deal farther, than the proposition, there is a God, — the trouble is that he does not firmly believe *that*, or does not have a worthy conception of the God of

Digitized by Google

nature. For no person with a healthy mind, it seems to us, can have an enlightened faith in God, without seeing that the main elements of Christian theology are involved in that belief, and must be accepted with it. The alternative for every fair logical mind is, Atheism or a broad Christian theory of life. There is no middle ground on which the intellect can stand. It is a characteristic of every system of simple truth, that the whole scheme is implied in each position, as the whole structure of an animal or fish may be constructed from a fossil tooth or scale. And Christianity has the unanswerable argument in its favor, that all its doctrines seem to be the natural evolution of our highest conception of God. The pure Deist is the most illogical of all men; and the language of Jesus to his disciples states with fine simplicity the force of the natural argument for his religion, — "Let not your heart be troubled: you believe in God, believe also in me."

Let us see how natural it is for an unprejudiced mind to hold a simple, abstract, fruitless faith in the mere existence of Deity.

Of course, if one believes in an overruling power, that power must be intelligent. The ultimate ground and cause of all things, too, must be Infinite and Eternal, and therefore, the Creative Spirit which is the object of faith must be an Infinite, self-existent Intelligence. So far the first step in reasoning carries us, or rather, so much the very conditions of reason necessitate.

Now if the universe be the work of an Infinite Creative Spirit, whatever characteristics and qualities are found clearly impressed upon, and exhibited in, the world, must be supposed to exist fully and perfectly as attributes and characteristics of the Deity. The appearance of any intelligent trait in the structure of nature is the hint that such a trait exists in perfection as a feature of the Creative Spirit. We discover in nature, in the widest and most contracted sphere, numberless, overwhelming traces of a foresight and adaptation fertile in resources, simple in plan; and from these the mind irresistibly ascribes to the Creator a *wisdom* that is perfect, and an exquisite *skill*. We see, too, that all the arrangements of this natural mechanism point to and promise good, so that, when they are not thwarted by wilfulness and vice, happiness, enjoy-

Digitized by Google

ment will prevail in the world; and of course, since the natural action of things would produce good alone, *benevolence*, goodness, must be a distinctive feature of the Creative mind.

Neither can our conception of the qualities of the Deity stop here. The principles which we have laid down develope further results. Looking into the intelligent creation, we discover a law of duty which reigns supreme over the souls of men; we find in every breast a *conscience*, which conveys the warning of a mysterious power, and which no one can, with impunity, reject. All the ranks of conscious spirits feel naturally the despotic claims of truth, holiness and virtue, as a myriad of needles point, with regular convergence and tremulous accuracy, to a common pole. Whence is the origin of this dread law? what the sanction of this authoritative principle which dignifies the most ignorant and the meanest, which abases the most powerful and cultivated of our race? Our religious instincts answer, and logic confirms the reply, — its Home is the nature of the Deity; its sanction is the character and pleasure of the Most High. It can be no where else. As skill in nature proves a wise, designing mind; as pleasure points to goodness in the Creative Spirit, so the instructive voice of morality and conscience in the human heart points to a nature infinitely Holy, a God all pure.

And now we are urged another step onward in the path we have taken. When we reflect that space is boundless and Time is Infinite, and when we consider that science reveals no limits to the physical creation, but shows us every spot of nature which the eye can penetrate, and all the regions which telescopic power has explored, alive with the energy of forces that sustain the present order of the universe; and since, from what we know of our own souls, we are compelled to believe that spirit is a subtile, impalpable, formless essence; reason can rest in no other view of the Deity but the belief that He is an Omnipresent, all-pervading principle of life and order, vivifying and encircling the world. He is not only the Creator, but the supporter of all things; "in Him we live, and move, and have our being."

If a man *believes* in a God, if his recognition of a

Digitized by Google

Higher power be not merely the instinctive, untrained feeling of dependence which moves alike the savage and philosopher, if reason clearly conceives the idea of God as an item of faith, it must hold it in some *form*, with certain definitions, and in the light of modern thought and culture, we are obliged, by the very considerations that lead us to a belief in a Supreme Being, and through the very process which establishes it as a certainty, to believe also that the Deity is good, wise, and holy, and that he exercises an omnipresent providence over the whole Creation. If we do not believe that these qualities form part of the Deity, it is because we do not reason on the question at all, it is because we do not have a *conviction*, but only a dim *instinct* that there is a God; for these qualities — goodness, wisdom, holiness, omnipresence, — necessarily flow from, or rather they must go to make up, the idea of God which the mind acquires. And these are precisely the attributes which distinguish Christian theology, which underlie and vivify the religion of the New Testament. So far the Deist must recognize the same elements of faith with the Christian, and to this extent the injunction of the Saviour is enforced — "Ye believe in God, believe also in me."

There is no point of religion, probably, about which there is more concealed or practical skepticism than the idea of immortality. This is always supposed to be a distinctive tenet of Christianity, and to be so connected with the New Testament theology that it falls to the ground when once the Gospel is denied. And yet enlightened faith in Deity necessitates this point. On natural, independent grounds, the idea of God suggests and establishes the belief that the human soul has a higher destiny than *is* attained, or than *can be* attained on earth. If we attempt to interpret life in the full blaze of the truth that it is ruled by a wise, holy, omnipresent will, we are impelled to the hypothesis that the present is the initiatory stage of a nobler scene. No man who has an *adequate* conception of the Deity can disbelieve his immortality; and the wide spread practical skepticism on this point only reveals the faintness and *haziness* of our faith in a Supreme Intelligence. A wise, benevolent and holy Governor must have a *purpose* in the creation of intelli-

Digitized by Google

gent and moral beings; if he be Perfect and Infinite, that purpose must be the noblest and most benevolent we can conceive, which is spiritual developement, education, progress. Now this is precisely what man, when we study the structure and laws of his nature, seems to be created for; and this goal cannot be reached in the present life, for two reasons: 1st. There are obstructions, trials, and mysteries here which must often impede our progress and even degrade our aims, if this life be all our destiny. There is not area or time enough for the plan of spiritual culture to vindicate itself in this finite state. And 2d. Spiritual excellence is of such a nature that the more one acquires, the more capacity is generated to acquire; it is the only work in which the soul cannot get exhausted, and where the field widens as the feet press on; attainments expand the *power* to go on; "it is a well of water" within him, and therefore, the very statement — "we are made for spiritual excellence" — implies and includes the tenet that we are to be immortal, since immortality is the indispensable condition of reaching the goal, or of unfolding the expansive energies enveloped in our nature. Independently then of the Christian Revelation, the skill, Holiness and Providence of God, all the qualities that make up our conception of the Deity, are pledged to the truth of our eternal being; human immortality is a necessary sequence from such premises; if such be not our destiny, the idea of God which all other departments of nature suggest to us, is overthrown by the phenomena of the intelligent universe; and the alternative is presented, to accept the tenet of immortality or to throw away the attributes which all nature ascribes to the Most High.

Thus far, we have spoken only of the abstract principles of theology. We see that mere belief in a God, under the light of modern culture, forces upon the mind a *system* of *religion*, a system corresponding to the essential principles of Christianity, and that no man can say, "I believe in a Great First Cause, but farther than that I cannot go." *In believing* that, he must, to be consistent, go a great deal farther. He must believe in *some kind* of a Divinity, and the only conception of the Infinite which reason in our time is able to approve, necessitates a train

Digitized by Google

of conclusions parallel with the revealed theology of the Gospel.

And not only does the idea of God include these speculative tenets which form a religious creed, but *duties* grow out of faith in a Supreme Intelligence. No man who firmly believes in a Deity can excuse himself from cherishing and manifesting a class of religious emotions or sentiments, similar to those enjoined and educated by Christianity. Is not gratitude a natural sentiment, obligatory in appropriate circumstances upon all men by the laws of our nature? Nay, do we not brand him who is habitually and coolly faithless in this respect, as unworthy the name of man? What claims for gratitude can be so great as that which grows out of our existence, the benevolent laws that surround us here, and the countless means of enjoyment supplied so liberally at every hand? Can the fact that the Giver works unseen cancel the demand, if we firmly believe that the Giver exists? Is not reverence, too, — the blending of awe and love, an instinctive affection of the soul, whenever it meets or contemplates a union in some man of the highest mental and moral qualities — justice, purity, mercy and wisdom? And shall not faith in a Being perfectly pure, holy and wise, of whom conscience is a feeble representative in our own bosoms, excite and sustain the feeling of reverence as a deep, vivifying, consecrating affection of the heart?

And we maintain that trust, too, the highest of the pietistic sentiments, is a natural disposition of the soul, and is aroused and sanctioned by a worthy conception of a God. The very intellectual perception of an omnipresent essence of skill, holiness and love, from which we were born and by which we are upheld, — and this is the form in which, as we have seen, we are forced to conceive the Almighty, — invites the heart to *trust*, suggests the propriety, even the necessity of such a feeling; and where the proposition is believed and the affection is not exhibited, there is an inconsistency between the mental and moral life. Thus there is a piety appropriate to Natural Religion, growing out of, and enforced by, the idea of God. If a person's reason be healthy and be applied to the subject, he cannot escape the obligations which belief in a Deity imposes on his heart; and the theory of worship which Christianity

Digitized by Google

enjoins — humility, reverence, love and prayer — is equally approved by a scientific faith in a Supreme Intelligence.

There are other considerations, also, flowing from a sufficient and exhaustive idea of God, which are fatal to a barren Deism, and which invite the mind to confidence in Christianity. The qualities which study of the universe leads us to ascribe to the Almighty, naturally suggest the probability of a clearer moral revelation of Himself. Can we conceive it possible that a Being perfectly wise and good, will refuse to communicate with His creatures, or can refrain from such a communion? It is the tendency of complete goodness and wisdom to publish, to manifest itself as widely and clearly as possible. No person, even though he be indifferent in practice to the truths of religion, will deny, that the knowledge of a benevolent, Infinite protector would be one of the greatest blessings for humanity. How then, if his mind believes in a wise and merciful Divinity, can he, *on natural grounds*, resist the probability that he would, or has, declared his character and the more secret counsels of His providence to His children? To believe that Revelation would be a most valuable blessing, and to believe in a perfectly wise and merciful Deity who has not revealed Himself, is practically to say that our own minds can conceive a good which we do not believe Infinite benevolence is prompted to bestow. The tendency to reveal Himself seems, therefore, to be part of the conception of a perfect Deity. The mind, too, feels deeply the need of Revelation. It needs it to enlighten conscience, to educate piety, to inspire strength, assurance and serenity in affliction, adversity, and gloom. Now the wisdom of the Creator has been so provident and watchful, that not a single native, healthy want of our structure, bodily, mental or affectional, has been left unsupplied. We feel hunger and there is food; thirst and there is drink; taste and there is beauty; desire for knowledge, and there is truth; sympathies and there is society; love and there are objects for love. This wise-spread, exquisite adaptation, never failing in any instance of deep native need, indicates the truth that the Governor of nature is perfectly wise and good. How then, with the whole mechanism of the universe to support and urge the argument, in the light of such continual Divine interference for our benefit, can the

Digitized by Google

Deist resist the conclusion that perfect wisdom has considered this abiding moral want of the soul, and has answered it, as it only can be answered, by an authoritative voice, conveyed through some agent to the waiting world. Can reason believe that God would create intelligent creatures for developement and spiritual excellence — as he evidently has done — and then leave them destitute of the highest means of education, means which only could be supplied by a disclosure of his nature to meet and satisfy, and to inspire and quicken them? This is equally inconsistent with Divine skill and Divine benevolence, and, as at other points we saw that the idea of God suggested doctrines analogous to those of Revelation, so on this point we find that the idea of God prompts the expectancy of Revelation itself. Therefore, since on every hand the tenets of natural religion and Christianity harmonize, and confirm each other, fresh meaning breaks from the Saviour's language, and we feel from another side the force of the principle — "Let not your heart be troubled; you believe in God, believe also in me."

It seems to us, also, that the obstacles which in our time often lie in the way of a grounded and secure faith in Christianity, will easily be removed by a clear and adequate conception of the Deity. Many persons, whose minds assent to the native probability of a Revelation, and who are attracted to the doctrines and spirit of the Gospel, feel repelled by the miraculous agency connected with it, and cannot reconcile their intellects to the occurrence of such violations of natural law. They confess the propriety and spiritual beauty of the Christian miracles, allow that they are worthy of God, and if once confirmed, furnish solid and consoling evidence of the Gospel's authoritative character, but they are unable to conceive how they were possible, being contrary to the custom of the universe. Now a pure and firmly grasped conception of a God does away this reluctance, by dissipating the prejudice on which it rests. When we realize that God must be omnipresent, the sustaining power of the world, and immediate cause of every event, as the soul sustains the body and directs its motion, we see that nature is only the manifestation of the successive volitions of a hidden spirit in its frame, we discover that there are no laws of matter established for

Digitized by Google

independent action, and thus are led to perceive that a seeming miracle is as natural and credible as any other occurrence, if the Creator but *pleases* that it should be wrought. Nothing is more needed to inspire a correct understanding of the kind of universe we live in, than a constant recognition that God is omnipresent in it, as the source of life and action. All mechanical theories fade before this view, and miracles, which to thousands are the only stumbling blocks in the path of Christian faith, seem in themselves no more marvellous than the rising of the sun, or bodily death. And thus, if we can perceive the fitness, force and need, of the wonderful agencies recorded in the Gospel, as proofs in a sensual age of the Divine mission of Jesus, all natural objection to them, all prejudice against them, is dissipated by the spiritual view under which God must be recognized as the sole source of power.

We have endeavored thus to intimate the vital connection between a firm belief in God and the truths of the Christian religion. The idea of a Supreme Intelligence naturally expands into the principal tenets of theology, while it leads us to anticipate a clearer Revelation, endorses the doctrines of the Gospel and dispels the only antecedent hindrances to its acceptance by the mind.

It is not very marvellous that there should be skeptical tendencies generated from the feverish materialism of modern life. Opportunities for special culture or religious meditation are either too rare, or are too steadily slighted, to allow the purity, grandeur, and harmony of the Gospel to attract, vivify and uplift the heart into an appreciation of its symmetrical, inspiring truth. From all the sources of evidence which spring up in a serene and mellow heart,—the very highest and most satisfactory of all proofs of its divinity,—by the fretful, seething sensualism of modern life we have been almost entirely debarred. Amid the roar of the machinery of our artificial, unhealthy, contentious existence, the charming influence of Christianity which falls upon the ear in gentle tones and invitations, sweet as the voice of birds, or the melodies of reviving nature, can hardly, by any possible means, be felt. To acquire the saintly assurance—the point where belief rises into insight—we must reach the saintly excellence, the

Digitized by Google

rest and calm of more natural and simple experience. Hence the greater necessity of maintaining firm the bulwark against skepticism on the side of *thought*. If faith may not yet be established beyond the possibility of question, by means of sentiments christianized and refined, it is a more binding duty to take care that unbelief makes no irruptions into the enclosure of the intellect, and that we preserve the reason untainted by a doubt. This may easily be done. We may be Christian philosophers, if we may not, because of the poverty of our hearts, attain the Christ-like conviction which only rewards a consecrated life. And so long as a man holds to, and confesses faith in God, it can only be weakness of logic or intellectual disease that can excuse any insecurity or hesitation with regard to the primary principles of Jesus' theology. Atheism is more consistent than a cold, unchristian, naked Deism. Let any man who has any tendency to skepticism upon the great themes of human interest, and who would discipline his mind to repel its ingress and refute its force, fall back upon the idea of God; let him reflect upon all that is implied in that belief, and he shall find that it is the basis and buttress of a vast system of theology, which enlightens the mysteries of the world, hallows the most soaring hopes, and imposes the most solemn obligations on the heart and will. Though we slight the historical claims of Christianity to our regard, it has still an ally in reason and the teachings of nature, which we cannot silence by contemptuous unconcern. With calm assurance the Gospel addresses the intellect of the world in the language, "You believe in God: believe also in me." Its logical foundations are secure so long as faith in an overruling power shall endure, and that can only fail when the structure of the human reason shall be radically changed.

T. S. K.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXXII.

Literary Notices.

1. The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament; being an attempt at a verbal connection between the Greek and the English texts: including a Concordance to the Proper Names, with Indexes, Greek-English and English-Greek. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1848.

This work is something new among us; and embodies in its plan many useful features. We know of no work for years, foreign or American, that is likely to do so much for the elucidation of the New Testament Scriptures; no work that is likely to encourage so much the diligent and critical study of these Scriptures, and that too among those who have hitherto never given such study to them for the want of suitable helps. It is what it professes to be, The *Englishman's Greek* Concordance; and it enables one who is wholly ignorant of the Greek, to investigate those questions which depend on the precise value of an original word or phrase, almost as easily and securely, as if he were familiar with the language. If he only knows the Greek alphabet, and is able to spell words, his inquiry will be attended with scarcely a single difficulty. But even if he do not know a letter of Greek, he will be able, with a little more labor, to ascertain the original of any English word, to determine its scriptural usage, its meaning in any particular passage, and the correctness of the translation, so far as that depends on usage. The Concordance with its indexes is admirably calculated to unfold and make intelligible the exact relations and distinctions, and the delicate, though sometimes important, shades of meaning, of Greek words and phrases; and to trace and illustrate the increase, or decrease, or change of force in their simple and compound forms.

For example: A person is reading John xvii. and comes to the 12th verse; "Those thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition." He wishes to know the original words which are rendered "lost" and "perdition," and their scriptural usage. He looks into the English-Greek index, and finds the word "lost," and opposite to it the page of the

Digitized by Google

Concordance on which the Greek word may be found. He turns to the page, 73, and soon discovers John xvii. 12, under the word *apollumi*, written in Greek and English letters. At the same time he sees all the passages in the New Testament where the same original word occurs. Of course he has before him, at a single glance, all the various translations of the word, and also all the examples of its use; and is therefore able, by a careful and diligent comparison of these, to decide for himself the true signification and value of the original word; and the particular shade of meaning which it bears in the passage under examination. He finds the word *apollumi* used some *eighty-seven* times in the New Testament, and translated by the English words, "lose," "destroy," "perish," "mar," "die." He then proceeds in his inquiry, and finds that the word is variously used, and applied to the "loss," "destruction," or "perishing" of *life*, a *limb*, *bottles*, the *sinner*, *wages* or *reward*, a *child*, a *sheep*, *money*, the *hair of the head*, *bread*, *existence itself* (1 Cor. xv. 18), the *heavens*, or *firmament*, etc. etc. And by the time he has finished the comparison and investigation of this various usage, he is able to judge with tolerable certainty of the precise value and force of the word. He pursues the same course with regard to "perdition." Looking into the index, he finds under the word a reference to page 78, turning to which he finds John xvii. 12, under *apoleia;* that this word occurs *twenty* times, and is translated by the English words "destruction," "waste," "perdition," "death," "damnable," "pernicious." He finds it is applied to the loss of *life*, *money*, the *sinner*, *precious ointment*, the *effects of false doctrines*, etc. By this time he is in possession of all the means the original Scriptures can furnish him in ascertaining the meaning of the passage in review; and indeed of every other passage in which these Greek words occur, so far as the interpretation depends on them.

The above will furnish as fair an illustration of the use and importance of the Englishman's Greek Concordance, as our limits will allow. We have never met a work of more value to those not acquainted with the Greek; or one that furnishes to the scholar more facilities for abridging the labor of investigation. It embodies the advantages of a Concordance, enabling the reader to find any passage he may wish to consult; a Lexicon, giving the scriptural definition of the words; and a doctrinal Commentary. It ought to be in every family, and in the library of every minister and student. The Harpers deserve the thanks of the Christian public, and specially of those interested in the promotion of Christian knowledge and study, for the issue of this most valuable work.

Digitized by Google

In concluding, we cannot omit pointing out one important defect. The English-Greek index, gives *only* the Greek form of the original, which of course is useless to one who does not know the Greek letters. He is obliged, therefore, to look over the whole page of the Concordance to which he is referred, and where the word is frequently used, over two or three pages, before he can find the passage under examination, and ascertain of which original word it is the translation. Now the editor should have given the word in Greek letters, and in English also, as he has done in the Concordance. Then the merely English reader would have discovered at the first glance the original word he sought, and under which he would find the desired passage. It is remarkable, since this is the *Englishman's* Concordance, such an oversight should have occurred. As it stands now, the English spelling of the Greek words in the Concordance is perfectly useless. T.

2. Scriptural Proofs and Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism. By John Wilson, etc. etc. Third Edition revised and enlarged. London: Chapman, Brothers, 121, Newgate-street. Manchester: the Author, etc. 1846. 8vo. pp. 346.

The author has well expressed the object of this book in the following language: "To inculcate what he conceives to be two of the great doctrines of the Bible,—the strict, undivided Unity of God, and the subordination of Christ to the universal Father." To us it appears to be the best work that we have ever seen on the subject, and the most exhaustive so far as respects the Biblical field of the argument. A large part of it is occupied by tables of Scripture-texts, arranged in such a way, under well-chosen heads and subdivisions, as to throw a clear light upon each other, and to illustrate the use which the Bible ordinarily makes of similar language. When we first cast our eye on these tables, we expected that they would prove to be rather dry reading; but we found them interspersed with observations so various, so candid, and so true to the point, as to make the whole interesting as well as instructive. Notwithstanding that we differ from the apparent views of the author, on some particulars, we are glad of this opportunity to commend his work to all inquirers into the scriptural doctrine in relation to the Trinity. He has published another volume, entitled "Concessions of Trinitarians," which, though we have not seen it, we suppose to be somewhat on the plan of that valuable work among us, "Paige's Selections from Eminent Commentators," etc. We only know that it is highly spoken of, by those who have read it.

Digitized by Google

3. The Green Mountain Boys: a Historical Tale of the Early Settlement of Vermont. By the Author of "May Martin, or the Money Diggers;" "Locke Amsden, or the Schoolmaster," etc. etc. Two Volumes in One. Revised Edition. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey and Company, 29 Cornhill. 1848. 12mo. pp. 364.

We have the impression that this work was written before the first appearance of "Locke Amsden," which was noticed in a former number of our publication; and if so, this may account for a greater inequality of manner, in its different parts. "The Green Mountain Boys," however, is worthy of much praise with respect to its design and execution, while the subject gives it a high degree of interest, at least to the natives and inhabitants of Vermont. We should have thought some of its scenes rather too extravagant, though not more so than many of Cooper's, had not the author told us that he has only given "the more romantic incidents which actually occurred in the early settlement of Vermont, with the use of but little more of fiction than was deemed sufficient to weave them together, and impart to the tissue a connected interest." Let us do our best to believe that "fact is stranger than fiction!" We may claim for it the distinction, that it is thoroughly an American novel, as much so as "Old Mortality" is a Scotch tale. The conversation is strongly marked with "Vermontese," the manners and the scenery are those of the Green Mountains, and the characters bear the type which has rendered the first settlers of that region famous for their rough, humorous hardihood, but high and generous courage. We confess, with mortification, that we are too ignorant of the particulars in the early history of Vermont to judge of the fidelity with which the author has presented them; but the prominence of some well-known names, and the air of truthfulness that generally pervades the descriptions, transport us at once among the old heroes of the Revolution, with the waters, woods, mountains and vallies around them, for which they fought.

4. Naomi; or Boston, Two Hundred Years ago. By Eliza Buckminster Lee, Author of the "Life of Jean Paul." Boston: Wm. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, 111 Washington-st. 1848. 16mo. pp. 448.

The heroine is a young lady of noble character and highly cultivated mind, who comes to Boston about the year 1660, and there moves in the first circles of society, though secretly a Quakeress. She soon has to pass through the ordeal of suspicion, detection, trial and banishment, to which those of her faith were then subjected. In the conduct of this interesting story, the author brings into view the state of the Province, the appearance of the Capital, the character of some of the ministers and dignita-

Digitized by Google

ries, and the prevalent manners and customs of the Puritans, as well as those of the lower order of Quakers. Her descriptions of natural scenery are marked with much truth and beauty; and the character of her heroine, Naomi, is very well drawn.

It is exceedingly difficult to do the Puritans exact justice,—to give their portrait without caricature, neither exaggerating its beauty, nor making its deformity too prominent. Their austerity, rigorous punctiliousness, and the harshness of their temper and manners, stand out in bold relief; while their thorough self-discipline, (perhaps we should have said self-mastery,) their conscientiousness, and the iron strength of character that underlaid the whole, are apt to be misappreciated, especially if a taint of prejudice has stolen into the breast of the observer, while contemplating the cruelties of which they were undeniably guilty. Still, it is equally undeniable that there were elements, in their character, which we sadly want at the present day, and which no people can be without, and yet maintain their excellence, or even their safety for any long period.

We think the author has succeeded better in describing the early Quakers, except in one respect. It has become too much the fashion to confound their doctrine of the "inward light," with cartain Transcendental notions of "the impersonal reason." The former was supposed to be a supernatural gift, bestowed by divine grace, and working in a purely religious way; the latter is regarded as the merely natural complement of the human soul, by virtue of its organic connection with Deity. Though the two ideas have points of seeming resemblance, they greatly differ in their nature, and no less in their influence. One may see the striking distinction at once, by comparing the religious spirit which pervades, say, the poems of the Quaker Whittier, with that which appears in almost any specimen of the religico-Transcendental poetry of our day.

5. Edinburgh Phrenological Journal and Magazine of Moral and Intellectual Science. Vol. I. No. 1. Edited by George Combe and Robert Cox. Republished by Fowlers and Wells, New York. 8vo.

A very handsomely printed periodical, with portraits on wood. The present number contains essays entitled, "National Education;" "Phrenology, its nature and uses;" "Phrenology and Mesmerism." Mr. Combe we suppose to be the most able and enthusiastic laborer in this field, at present. One may certainly find valuable suggestions even in Phrenology; but to think of deducing a Moral and Intellectual Science out of it, shows that the "organ of causality" is not well developed. That there is truth in Phrenology as a fact, we need not doubt; so there is in Phys-

Digitized by Google

iognomy; so, too, it will be found there is in Podology, whenever its Galls and Spurzheims shall appear,—and then we shall have the spiritual universe illustrated by the developements of Tarsals, Metatarsals, Phalanges, etc. Heaven preserve the foot of a Combe, till that epoch in the progress of the species!

6. The Prisoners' Friend: a Monthly Magazine, devoted to Criminal Reform, Philosophy, Literature, Science and Art, etc. etc. Charles Spear, Editor and Proprietor. Boston: Published by the Editor, 40 Cornhill. London: Charles Gilpin. 1848. 8vo.

We would do all we can to commend this Magazine to public attention. It contains some very good articles; and its list of distinguished persons who are correspondents and contributors, gives promise of much information and interest. But above all these claims, is the importance of the cause to which it is chiefly devoted,—criminal reform, amelioration of punishments, and provision for the prisoner when he is discharged. On these subjects, the community has a great duty to perform, of which it is yet, to a considerable degree, ignorant. The circulation of this Magazine cannot fail to diffuse light that is very much needed. The names of Prof. T. C. Upham, of Bowdoin College, Freeman Hunt, of the Merchants' Magazine, Isaac T. Hopper, Prof. H. S. Patterson, A. J. H. Duganne, T. B. Read, Dr. J. E. Snodgrass, and Charles H. Brainard, are given as correspondents; and as contributors, Dr. Walter Channing, Hon. Robert Rantoul, Jr., J. A. Andrew, Charles Sumner, Rev. D. K. Lee, Rev. Caleb Stetson, Dr. S. G. Howe, John W. Browne, Mrs. E. W. Farnham, Mrs. M. A. Livermore, and Mrs. H. J. Lewis.

7. The Writings of Cassius Marcellus Clay: including Speeches and Addresses. Edited with a Preface and Memoir, by Horace Greeley. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, No. 82 Cliff-street. 1848. 8vo. pp. 536.

It will be no news to many of our readers, that the writings of Cassius M. Clay are among the most remarkable productions of our living public men. Evidently thrown off hastily, in the form in which they were first penned or spoken, with many shaggy ends left hanging to his sentences, and, it must be acknowledged, with several examples of "crack" oratory unreformed, they still abound with substantial excellences. On the subject of slavery, they set home the most important truths, by an array of facts, and a force of popular reasoning, that cannot be withstood, and that go at once to the conscience and self-interest of all; while the rather stormy vehemence, with which the argument is conducted, is quite foreign from any morbidness or fanaticism, and

Digitized by Google

pervaded by hearty social good-nature. A sound understanding, practical common-sense, a clear and tolerably wide scope of vision, are almost every where apparent, as well as uncompromizing devotion to the rights of man. He runs into no visionary speculations; he scarcely meddles even with a metaphysical question; and when he does, he sometimes fails to touch the point; every thing is plain matter of fact. The character which these writings evince of the author, (for nothing can be more significant in this respect,) gives them additional interest. He is a man of great heart, a Luther on a smaller scale; rough, strong in will, ardent, egotistical, but of a genial temper that sympathizes with all classes, and with a courage that hardly takes account of danger when himself only is concerned. He may be warm in his resentments, as well as in his attachments, but without a spice of malice in his composition. On reading his volume, we seem to be as well acquainted with his character, as if we had held personal intercourse with him,—so perfectly transparent is his mind, and so communicative his manner.

The noble stand which he took, even at an early age, for the cause of freedom, in a slave-holding community, and the perilous sacrifice to which he was at length subjected, in the attempt to stop all discussion by violence, have made his name dear to every lover of human rights. Long may it be honored! and proud of his memory will his own native state be, in coming times.

Enough has been said, in the public papers, on the one great mistake he afterwards committed. There can be no doubt that he was led into it, by a wrong notion of what loyalty required, as well as by a generous spirit of self-sacrifice, and a hope of doing by this means a greater good in future. With some others, he overlooked an important distinction in the case. It was not, in any sense, a question whether he should yield obedience to "the powers that be;" it was simply the question whether he should gratuitously join in committing a great wrong, because the supreme authority of the nation had undertaken it. He was not called upon personally to become an actor in the guilt; he volunteered to do it, of his own free-will, and therefore assumed the moral responsibility on himself. When Congress shall have passed a law that slavery be admitted into the provinces we have conquered for that purpose, will Mr. Clay volunteer, in his gratuitous chivalry, to drive a coffle of blacks thither? While Kentucky maintains the "institution" in his own state, does he feel bound to risk life and limb in promoting it? The fact is, the common sense of all men pronounces, that when the constituted authorities of any country enter on a measure that we are thoroughly persuaded is morally wrong, we are under no obli-

Digitized by Google

gations to aid in its furtherance, at least till our help is exacted by due process of law. Those who are conscientiously opposed to capital punishment, for instance, ought to withhold their countenance from the practice of hanging, though it be legally ordained, and leave the barbarous work to such as are appointed to perform it. And we think it almost as important in a civil respect, as it is in the moral, that this principle should be universally understood and acted upon. It is one of the wholesome checks which the people have on their rulers, both prospectively and retrospectively. An extreme and questionable measure would be greatly retarded in its passage into a law, if it were known beforehand that it must, after all, be approved by the conscience of the people, in order to command their active support; but if it become a rule that any step, "right or wrong," will be unanimously carried out, when once sanctioned by enactments, what greater encouragement can be offered to the artifices and intriguing manœuvres of politicians?

8. The Rose of Sharon: A Religious Souvenir, for 1849. Edited by Mrs. S. C. Edgarton Mayo. Boston: A. Tompkins, and B. B. Mussey.

The tenth volume of this popular annual is before us; and though we greet it with a glad welcome, the welcome is shaded with sadness. This is the last of the Rose we shall ever greet from the hand of its first and favorite editor, Mrs. Mayo. She suddenly departed this life on the 9th of July last, in the midst of her useful work here, having made this earth better by her presence and righteous toiling.

The Preface to the present volume of the Rose is written by the bereaved husband of the editor. It is an appropriate word to the living, and a worthy tribute to the dead. There are thirty-three articles in the book from the following contributors, viz; Revs. J. G. Adams, T. S. King, C. F. Lefevre, H. Bacon, E. H. Chapin, A. B. Grosh, A. D. Mayo; Ladies, Mrs. S. C. E. Mayo, C. M. Sawyer, N. T. Munroe, H. J. Lewis, F. M. Chesboro, E. A. Bacon, Misses E. A. Starr, L. M. Barker, and M. A. H. Dodd. It is but justice to say that the issue for 1849 will compare well with any other preceding volume. There are some excellent articles which we need not here designate,—Mrs. Mayo's last written one among them. The stories are well conceived and written; not dull nor meaningless, but good and pertinent, which is no small word to say of stories, now. The notice of the editor, by Rev. H. Bacon, is the last article, and does honor to the pen and heart of the writer, who was her very near friend. Extracts from her letter-correspondence accompany this notice. This portion of the Rose will be read with deep interest. The plates

Digitized by Google

are very beautiful mezzotintos, by Sartain, and with one slight exception, are admirable. "The Dawn of Love" is one of the most excellent engravings of the kind we have seen issued from the American press. The mechanical execution of the Rose is in keeping with its appearance in other years. No neater looking annual without, or more profitable one within, is offered to the New England public; and no one meets with a readier demand. Long life and brighter days to it! May the spirit of the gifted and departed editor still live in its pages! A.

9. Poems by John G. Whittier, illustrated by H. Billings. Engraved by A. C. Warren, &c., &c. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey & Co. 1849. 8vo.

We give a notice of this forth-coming work, at so early a date, because we take a peculiar interest in it, and wish to bespeak the attention of our readers in season for its appearance. The place which properly belongs to Mr. Whittier, among American poets, and which will finally be conceded to him, has not as yet been generally recognized in our republic of letters. If we look into the leading Magazines and Reviews, we shall find several other names placed apparently above his, at least occupying a greater share of attention; although we believe that whatsoever has been said of him, shows a respectful estimation of his excellence, and sometimes appears to indicate a secret consciousness that his rank may be rather higher than we are, at present, ready to assign him. The terrible earnestness with which he deals with slavery, in all its relations and doings, the resistless power with which he calls up against it all that is manly in the human heart, and the energy with which the Reformer speaks out in his poetry, must of course exclude much of his productions, just now, from our fashionable literature. We speak of this as a matter that is of no concern to him, or to any body else. His voice is out over all the echoing hills and vallies of our land; his soul is within the souls of millions, doing its work there, in an earnestness too great to allow the question to come up, whether the influence be that of the best marketable kind of poetry, or not. When its work is done, and the excitement past, these wonder-working strains will be repeated and admired by amateur devotees of genius, and their exceeding power illustrated according to the rules of art.

Another thing, also, has contributed to delay an unhesitating, whole-hearted expression of approval. He has thrown off some pieces that, perhaps, are not of extraordinary merit. But even of his best legendary, and descriptive, and reflective poetry, the character is so different, both in form and spirit, from that of the fine specimens which judges of mere artistic perfection are wont to extol, that many are fearful of giving free scope to their admi-

Digitized by Google

ration, lest they should betray an uncultivated taste. His communion with nature is out in the open air, not in the parlor, nor in the student's closet. His landscapes, whether tastefully chosen or not, are so perfect in truth and freshness, that they actually breathe of the forests, fields and waters,—we mean of those which God has made, not which the virtuoso has designed, for there are two sorts of nature even. His expressions of sentiment come from a depth of noble affections that we scarcely find in any other writer. It is not here our business, however, to write a *critique* on his poems; we only wish our readers to come to them with an unsophisticated heart, and a love of nature in the dress that God has given her.

This edition is beautifully printed; and it is to be embellished with a portrait of the author, as well as with designs and plates from our best artists.

10. Modern French Literature. By L. Raymond de Vericour, formerly Lecturer in the Royal Athenæum, Paris; Author of "Milton et la Poesie Epique;" Member of the Archæological Society, Rome; &c., &c. Revised, with Notes, alluding particularly to Writers prominent in late Political Events in Paris. By William Staughton Chase, A. M. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 59 Washington Street. 1848. 12mo. pp. 448.

The author aims to embrace, in this treatise, a very wide and multifarious range of subject,—the literature of France during the present century, together with a brief historical survey of its previous condition and progress. This complicate and difficult task he has performed with evident ability, and certainly with much interest; presenting the whole in a regular onward course of developement, as a living process, and not as a mere collection of isolated particulars. When we have said this, we have gone about as far as we are qualified to go, in speaking of the general merits of his work. For it will not be supposed that we have the knowledge requisite to a judgment of the accuracy with which he has reviewed the several writers, and estimated their productions. In this, however, he seems to have received the approbation of those who are better able to pronounce on his claims.

After summarily sketching out the history of French literature in general, from Villehardouin in the thirteenth century to our day, he proceeds to the several divisions of his work, which are chiefly the following: 1. *Intellectual Philosophy.* Physiological or Sensualist School, at the close of the eighteenth century; Theologic or Catholic School; formation of the Eclectic School; and the refutations of its philosophy. 2. *Political Tendencies.* Bonald; Chateaubriand; Guizot; Paul-Louis Courier; Beranger; Cormenin; Lamennais; Socialism, St. Simon, Fourier; M. de Tocqueville's Work;

Digitized by Google

Political Oratory, &c., &c. 3. *Criticism*, its progress. La Harpe; Sismondi; M. Villemair; histories of Port Royal; M. Planche; M. Ampère; Chateaubriand; study of English and German literature in France; Victor Hugo; Periodical Press, Reviews, Newspapers; Education; Royal University of France; Classic Learning, &c., &c. 4. *History.* Former Historians of France; M. Augustin Thierry; M. Amedée Thierry; Guizot; Sismondi; Dulaure; Monteil; Mignet; Thiers; works on the French Revolution; Bignon; Chateaubriand; Michelet; D'Aubigné; M. Salvador; Barante; M. Daru; M. Capefigue; Mazure; Armand Carrel; Fauriel; Count Segur; Michaud; Lécluze; St. Hilaire; M. Matter; De Beaumont; Military Histories, &c.; Memoirs; M. de Stael, &c.; Biography, &c. 5. *Romance.* Influence of Sir W. Scott; French Novel, its tendency; Chateaubriand; Madame de Stael; Victor Hugo; Alfred de Vigny; Balzac; George Sand (Madame Dudevant,); Eugène Sue; Corbière, &c., &c.; Alexandre Dumas; Charles de Bernard, &c., &c.; Edgar Quinet; Paul de Kock, &c., &c.; 6. *The Drama.* Influence of Shakspeare, of Schiller and Goethe; remarks on Molière, &c.; flourishing state of *Tragedie* during absolute monarchy; its fall with dospotism; its subsequent condition, Lemercier, Raynouard, &c.; Talma's acting; final ascendant of the *Drame*, towards 1830; Casimir Delavigne; character of the new Drama, its excesses, &c.; Victor Hugo; Vitet; Alexandre Dumas; Alfred de Vigny, &c. 7. *Poetry.* Modern School of French Poetry; influence of Voltaire; Delille; Legouvé, &c.; De Fontanes; André Chénier; Alfred de Vigny; Lamartine; Victor Hugo; De Beranger; Casimir Delavigne; Sainte-Beuve; Emile Deschamp; Alfred de Musset; Auguste Barbier; Ganthier, &c.

This imperfect table of contents will perhaps give an idea of the extent of M. Vericour's plan, and of the great variety of important or interesting topics with which it is filled up. At the end of the volume, are some sixty or seventy pages of Notes, by the Editor, on certain phases of French literature, on the peculiar manner in which it is conducted, and on some of the most distinguished French writers, especially those who have figured in the present revolution. The whole is closed with a list of French authors of this century. It will be seen that the volume is intended to answer for a tolerably complete introduction to the study of the subject, at the same time that it supplies a place which, so far as we know, has never before been occupied by an English work.

M. Vericour is a confident admirer of the French Eclectic Philosophy, and of its distinguished teacher, if not creator, M. Cousin. We confess that, to us, the very method of this school seems an absurdity. What is the Eclectic Philosophy? Not an

Digitized by Google

indiscriminate synchresis of all systems; but a selection, as it professes, of all the sound parts of each. By what criterion? we ask. Here comes the difficulty. We must have a philosophy, at the outset, by which to determine what are the sound parts; and this philosophy by which we try all other systems, and by which we select from them, is our distinguishing philosophy, and is, itself, not eclectic, but lies back of all eclecticism. Then, again, if our business be, not to develope that one philosophy out legitimately to its results, but, as the eclectics boast, to find some common ground on which all the different schools can meet, by mutual compromise and retrenchments, what can be plainer than that we are not philosophizing, but compounding? as if we should try to grow a tree, not by developing the germ according to the laws of vegetative life, but by skilfully selecting pieces of wood, that will match, from all the different species in the forest, and then incorporating them into a trunk and branches, of the desired figure. M. Vericour is by no means blind to several of Cousin's arbitrary assumptions and dexterous shifts; but he evidently does not see some of his faults that are far worse than simple errors in reasoning. "M. Cousin," says he, "has been accused of various infidel tendencies; but of his respect for that religion, whose mild influence upon society makes it a fitting handmaid to the lights of the present age, we cannot adduce more satisfactory testimony than by referring to almost every page of his lectures," &c. Yes, M. Vericour, that is the word; M. Cousin's religion, or Christianity, is indeed a *handmaid* to the great lights of the present age; he himself condescends to patronize her. French vanity can go no higher; *c'est le dernier mot.*

There are several other things in this work that we should like to remark upon; especially, the indulgence shown to some of the seductive French novels. The author seems unconscious that the elements of voluptuousness may be the more corrupting from the very absence of those coarse and beastly manifestations which we find in Indiana and, it is said, in Lelia. But we are writing a notice, not a review; and we will conclude, by thanking the editor for the wide field of interest and information he has opened to the American reader.

11. Discussion between Rev. A. Latham, Methodist, and Rev. J. M. Cook, Universalist. Subject, John 5: 28, 29, &c., &c. Providence: Printed by Knowles & Vose. 1847. 8vo. pp. 136.

12. Review of Alexander Hall against Universalism. By J. Henry Jordan, M. D. Indianapolis: Published by E. Manford. 1848. 16mo. pp. 449.

Public oral discussions between theologians are more likely to be interesting to the hearers, than to prove instructive to the

Digitized by Google

readers; with whom the frequent misunderstandings, evasions and detections, that give life to the debate, lose their interest when put on paper. Yet we have found the first of these volumes worthy of perusal, and marked with some curious specimens of Greek philology from a gentleman who, we understand, has since taken his first lessons in the language.

The second work, though written in a somewhat declamatory style, is a more labored production, and goes over the grounds on which Universalism is usually attacked and defended. It does not, however, tread the beaten path, but branches off into new courses of argumentation, and sometimes into new views, on which there may be a difference of opinion among Universalists themselves. Though we should not agree with every interpretation here given of texts, we cordially love and honor the author's faithfulness in trying the cause by "the law and the testimony."

13. Life, Letters, and Literary Remains of John Keats. Edited by Richard Moncton Milnes. In Two Volumes. London: Edward Moxon. 1848. (Republished by Putnam, New York.)

Mr. Milnes, we believe, has the reputation of being a very lazy man, and certainly we do not see how the late appearance of these volumes can be accounted for, unless this reputation of the author is deserved. According to the Preface, the materials of this biography have been in his possession a number of years, while the editorial matter is so trifling, and the editorial labor has plainly been so slight, that a leisure hour applied daily for a month or two, would have been all-sufficient for the task.

This Life of Keats ought to have appeared long ago, for it will modify essentially the current estimate of his character and genius. Keats's fame, notwithstanding the savage hostility of the Tory critics of his time, and despite the opinion of his admirer Shelley, that his works would never be popular, is now firmly established. His poetic powers have been willingly acknowledged and fairly appreciated by critics, and his works are widely circulated and admired in the literary world.

But the nature of the man has been misconceived. Many who admire his poetry, have always supposed, in the language of Mr. Milnes, that his "moral disposition was weak, gluttonous of sensual excitement, querulous of severe judgment, fantastical in its tastes, and lackadaisical in its sentiments." His genius, too, has been thought wayward and erratic "self-indulgent in conceits, disrespectful of the rules and limitations of Art, not only unlearned but careless of knowledge, not only exaggerated but despising proportion." But whoever reads his letters to his friends, will see that, with true genius, he possessed the modesty of

Digitized by Google

genius, that his character was manly, his ambition healthy, and his will strong, that he had no feverish thirst for popular praise, that his ideal of Art was pure and high, and that the difference between his "Endymion" and "Hyperion," is only the measure of a gradual growth of genius and taste, which he endeavored to stimulate and foster by untiring energy and the healthiest means. It is much to be lamented that these volumes could not have been published immediately after his death, that his savage critics might have been punished by seeing the promise which they tried to blight, and by knowing the character which they presumed to scorn.

There is little interest in this biography, apart from the record it gives us of the growth of the poet's nature. The events of his life were few and simple, but the record of them presents to us, in another shape, the old tragedy of young and splendid genius struggling with embarrassments, poverty, and the aversion of the world. It has always been supposed that Keats's last illness was induced by the violent shock which the review in the "Quarterly" produced upon his delicate and confiding, but ambitious nature. His letters, however, and the evidence of dates completely overthrow the story. It is very singular that it should have obtained such currency, and especially that Shelley should have been allowed to endorse it in his Elegy. The fact is, as we read the letters in this volume, the Review appeared in 1818, while the rupture of the blood-vessel which brought on his fatal illness did not happen till the spring of 1820. And moreover, all the letters which he wrote to his friends after the hostile criticism, are very calm, and show that his confidence in his abilities and prospects was but slightly disturbed. We may also say here, that Shelley, in the preface to "Adonais," states that Keats died in Rome, the 27th December, 1820, whereas the date of his death was February 23, 1821.

Mr. Milnes has collected the unpublished fragments and scattered poems of Keats which remained in the keeping of his friends. Among them is a Tragedy entitled "Otho the Great," the diction of which he furnished, while his friend Mr. Brown supplied the fable and plot. It is rich poetry, but a poor play. The letters plainly show that Keats possessed a very subtile mind, and the delicacy of his expression in prose often rivals the keenness of Shelley's poetic diction. We should delight to quote many extracts, which are really worth preserving, from the best of them, but our limits will not permit. To the admirers of Keats's genius, this work will be a treasure, while it will impress any reader with a higher idea of his abilities, and a feeling of regret at his too early death. K.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Acme
Bookbinding Co., Inc.
300 Summer Street
Boston, Mass. 02210

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google